Volume XLIII] *October, 1937* [*Number 1*

The American Historical Review

EARLY PARLIAMENTARY ORGANIZATION

THE large literature upon the medieval English great council and its successor, parliament, has created no very definite picture of the organization of that institution.[1] Yet this is obviously important, not only for its intrinsic value, but because the functioning of an institution naturally expresses itself in its physical make-up. Constitutional principles are reflected in such phenomena as seating and attendance, and constitutional development is apparent in their changes. At first sight the evidence for seating, consisting of chance statements in chronicles, in the description of parliament known as the *Modus tenendi parliamentum*,[2] and in other literature, might not seem sufficient. The proof that charter witness lists are also seating lists adds much information, particularly upon the positions of individuals.[3] With this body of evidence available, an approach to constitutional development by a study of early organization seems worth trying. In this study we discuss first, since the evidence is abundant, (I) the seating of the upper classes and (II) the principles underlying it. Then we take up (III) the principles of assembly attendance, (IV) the problem of the presence of lesser folk prior to the use of summons by writ (about 1254), (V) their presence as groups summoned by writ, and (VI) the compromise, caused by their presence, in the organization of parliament. The period under consideration is approximately that from the Conquest into the reign of Edward II.

This approach has led to certain theses which differ somewhat from the usual explanations of parliamentary development. They are presented tentatively and may be stated as follows. The English assembly was organized according to the normal pattern which social custom

[1] An accurate account of some of the seating arrangements of councils appears in Hubert Hall, *Court Life under the Plantagenets* (London, 1890), p. 82. A short statement of the seating of the groups appears in A. F. Pollard, *The Evolution of Parliament* (London, 1920), p. 121.

[2] Used effectively by M. V. Clarke in her *Medieval Representation and Consent* (Oxford, 1936), pp. 220-3.

[3] See Josiah Cox Russell, "Social Status at the Court of King John", *Speculum*, XII (1937), 319-20.

prescribed for the arrangement of persons in meetings: the separation of social groups (*ordines, gradus*) and precedence according to personal dignity (*dignitas*). Attendance at first varied, according to the business of the meeting, as social custom and royal discretion might direct. Lesser folk might and did attend before they were summoned by writ, but they counted for little. Writs not merely regularized their attendance but enabled them to form separate groups and to develop their ideas of organization. The influence of lesser folk probably accounts for the modification of the organization of parliament along lines which approach those of our modern assemblies based on membership and representation. Before taking up these topics let us survey briefly the types of available evidence upon which this study is based.

The *Modus tenendi parliamentum*, a treatise probably written about 1321,[4] was of a type of practical, descriptive manual rather common in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century.[5] Presumably, then, it was a reasonably accurate account of parliamentary practice, though with a bias in favor of certain ideas of the author. Its principles of seating by rank and status can be projected back into earlier centuries since such a conception of society goes back at least as far as the early German law codes.[6] However, the name given to the divisions of the assembly, *gradus*, and some of the divisions are probably not very ancient. As we shall see, the older word was *ordo* and seems to have had a broader meaning. The *gradus* of the document are: (1) the king; (2) archbishops, bishops, abbots, and priors; (3) proctors of the clergy; (4) earls and barons; (5) knights of the shires; and (6) citizens and burgesses. Within each group persons were to sit by precedence. The *Modus* assumes that the nobility will probably be present and that the representatives must be there unless excused. Voting is not mentioned. Indeed, the statement that the opinion of two representatives of the shire is equal to that of an earl upon certain occasions presents a quite different idea.[7]

Some information about attendance and seating appears in the

[4] W. A. Morris, "The Date of the *Modus Tenendi Parliamentum*", *English Historical Review*, XLIX (1934), 407-22; Clarke, pp. 193, 228, 244-6. In her review of the latter Miss Cam insists that the case for a later date of composition is not yet closed. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, LI (1936), 703-4. The document is edited in William Stubbs, *Select Charters* (Oxford, 1921), pp. 500-6 and in Clarke, pp. 374-84.

[5] Clarke, p. 15.

[6] E. H. McNeal, *Minores et Mediocres in the Germanic Tribal Laws* (Columbus, 1905) or any collection of early Germanic laws illustrates this.

[7] Stubbs, *Select Charters*, p. 504; Clarke, p. 382.

chronicles and other literature of the time. By far the largest group of items refers simply to the attendance of specified groups at meetings of the great council: sometimes merely the twofold group of "clerus et populus" and sometimes a more detailed list, such as "archbishops, bishops, and abbots, earls and barons". These give, not a complete catalogue of those present, but an estimate of the importance of the meeting as indicated by a recital of the more important classes there. Beginning with the greater personages or social groups, they end without regularity and often omit important elements which are known from other sources to have attended.[8] Moreover, the chronicles often give items about seating which range from mere indications that customary seats did exist to specific statements of where people sat.[9] There are no references to actual numbers in attendance, to proportions of membership, or other details which would interest reporters assigned to legislative assemblies today. The order of social classes is usually that of the *Modus*.

Of great value for the seating arrangements and the attendance at the great council are the masses of charter witness lists coming from this period. A study of selected groups of these lists shows that in any series of charters containing constantly recurring names these names vary but little in order.[10] This holds for documents of monastic manors as well as for those of the king's court. It can be shown that the order at the royal court conforms to other evidence of seating arrangements.[11] This is what might be expected. The clerk simply recorded the names of the men in the order in which they sat before him. The witness lists are thus seating lists. Here again, if we examine the order of persons by social groups, we find the same precedence as that revealed by the *Modus* and the chronicles. Since these lists usually end with the words "et multis aliis", we do not have a complete catalogue of those present.[12] These

[8] D. Pasquet, *Essay on the Origins of the House of Commons*, tr. by R. G. D. Laffan, with additions by G. Lapsley (Cambridge, 1925), p. 14; W. E. Lunt, "The Consent of the English Lower Clergy to Taxation", *Facts and Factors in Economic History: Articles by Former Students of E. F. Gay* (Cambridge, 1932), pp. 71-2. For a very important instance of this, the accounts of the committee of estates of 1327, see Clarke, pp. 187-91.

[9] "Loco solito", *Eadmeri historia novorum in Anglia*, M. Rule, ed. (Rolls series), p. 62; *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, J. C. Robertson, ed. (Rolls series), III, 57.

[10] See Josiah Cox Russell, "Significance of Charter Witness Lists in Thirteenth Century England", *New Mexico Normal University Bulletin* (August, 1930, suppl.). When this was written I did not realize that these lists were seating lists.

[11] See evidence below for seating of bishops, and Russell, *Speculum*, XII, 321-4.

[12] The contrary is assumed by Pasquet, p. 4, and, for a much earlier date, by W. J. Corbett in his chapter, "England (to c. 800 and English Institutions", in *Cambridge Medieval History*, II, 569.

lists, even though not modern roll call records, do present the precedence of many individuals even within the same social group.

These statements about the sources of information concerning attendance and seating show that medieval ideas of group arrangement were essentially different from ours. Instead of quorums, membership, parties, majorities, voting, and counting by head, words typical of a democratic age of representative equality, we find an emphasis upon inequality of social groups. It was an age which was shocked by the presiding of a priest, even though a cardinal priest, over bishops and abbots.[13]

I

Before proceeding to a discussion of the principles of seating arrangements let us try to get as detailed a picture as possible of the upper classes in assembly. With the aid of charter witness lists the sources give a fairly clear picture of the precedence enjoyed by the royal and noble classes. Their constitutional position remained stable in the period which we are considering; the *Modus* confirms what the earlier evidence gives in regard to them. All authorities admit that these groups attended important meetings of the assembly throughout the whole period. Those in attendance apparently arranged themselves about an open square or circle since speakers are said to speak "in medio",[14] and other evidence of position supports this opinion.

The first *gradus*, as the *Modus* informs us forcefully, was that of the king. The very insistence of the author arouses at least a little suspicion. Did not the archbishop of Canterbury sit on his right hand and the archbishop of York on his left?[15] Had the *Modus* not been so specific, it might be argued from the seating that the first *gradus* consisted of the king and the archbishops. Indeed, the position of the archbishop of Canterbury was in some respects similar to that of an eastern metropolitan, who occupied a position more exalted than that of a western archbishop;

[13] *Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury*, W. Stubbs, ed. (Rolls series), II, 381.

[14] "Itaque Anselmus in medio procerum et conglobate multitudinis sedens ita orsus est." Anselm was not in the same group with the king, however. *Eadmeri historia novorum in Anglia*, p. 56. "Ricardus de Luci surgens et in medio stans", *Chronicon de bello* (Anglia Christiana Society), p. 88. William of Raleigh speaking for the king, "surrexit in medio". *Matthaei Parisiensis . . . chronica majora*, Henry Richard Luard, ed. (Rolls series), III, 380.

[15] Stubbs, *Select Charters*, p. 504; *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Hovedene*, W. Stubbs, ed. (Rolls series), III, 240. The seat of honor was long the subject of dispute between the two archbishops. For incidents in this dispute see H. Wharton, *Anglia sacra*, I, 65-77; *Historical Works of Master Ralph de Diceto*, W. Stubbs, ed. (Rolls series), I, 405-6; *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis*, W. Stubbs, ed. (Rolls series), I, 113; *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I*, R. Howlett, ed. (Rolls series), I, 204.

the latter usually was hardly more than chairman of the bishops of his province.[16]

As a group, the bishops probably sat to the right of the king. This was the case at a banquet in 1236.[17] There is little reason to believe that the social arrangements here differed from the political. Among the bishops themselves a well-fixed order of precedence existed. In 1072 Lanfranc asked about precedence within the group and learned that the archbishop of Canterbury had the seat of honor, followed by the archbishop of York, the bishops of London and Winchester, and after them the other bishops according to seniority of consecration.[18] A Canterbury monk stated the rule again a century later.[19] In 1221 the bishop of Salisbury was trying to secure permanent right to precedence after the bishop of Winchester.[20] The witness lists, especially of charters written upon solemn occasions when the clerks could see the actual seating arrangements, confirm this order.[21] The abbots followed the bishops, with the abbot of St. Albans first.[22] The precedence of the heads of monastic houses is alleged to have been that of the order of consecration, but this is more difficult to verify.[23] After the abbots came the priors.

At the banquet mentioned above the barons sat to the left of the

[16] W. T. Townsend, "Metropolitans in the Western Church", *Church Quarterly Review*, CXX (1935), 229-40.

[17] *Red Book of the Exchequer*, Hubert Hall, ed. (Rolls series), II, 757.

[18] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis monachi de gestis regum Anglorum*, W. Stubbs, ed. (Rolls series), II, 353; *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis monachi de gestis pontificum*, N. E. S. A. Hamilton, ed. (Rolls series), p. 67; *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, II, 326-8; *Matthaei Parisiensis . . . chronica majora*, IV, 83-4.

[19] *Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury*, I, 251.

[20] J. C. Russell and J. P. Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems of Master Henry of Avranches relating to England* (Cambridge, 1935), p. 82.

[21] The Magna Carta list of 1225 runs: archbishop of Canterbury, bishops of London, Bath (1206), Winchester, Lincoln (1209), Salisbury (1215-17), Rochester (1215), Worcester (1218), Ely (1220), Hereford (1219), Chichester (1221), and Exeter (1224). The dates given are those of the bishops' consecrations. The bishop of Salisbury had been translated in 1217 from Chichester where he had been consecrated as bishop in 1215. It will be noticed that the name of the bishop of Winchester should have preceded that of the bishop of Bath because he had a permanent position, and that the name of the bishop of Hereford should have appeared before that of Ely because he was consecrated earlier. Mathematically there are two mistakes out of a possible sixty-six. Stubbs, *Select Charters*, p. 350.

[22] *Matthaei Parisiensis . . . chronica majora*, III, 337. A charter of Pope Honorius III confirming the abbot of St. Albans in this position is in the British Museum, Harley MS. 3775, f. 126^{v}.

[23] *Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury*, I, 251; *Matthaei Parisiensis . . . chronica majora*, III, 337. The list of abbots of 1225 seems to follow roughly the order of consecration. Stubbs, *Select Charters*, p. 350.

king.[24] Such a location in the great council would have caused them to face the bishops and would help to explain the emphatic use of "You" and "We" in an altercation between these groups at Northampton in 1164.[25] Within the group of earls and barons precedence was better established than might have been expected, since their titles lacked some of the permanent factors inherent in the office of bishop or abbot.[26] The basis for their precedence, beyond the superiority of earl over baron, is uncertain, but partially, at least, it was based upon the amount of knight's service which the lord owed the king.[27]

In the assembly, however, the king and his great men did not appear by themselves. The king's personal entourage was more obvious than those of the others; we know that it was near him.[28] Evidence remains of the orderly and regular arrangements of the lords for taking followers to the king's court,[29] of the summons to retainers to accompany their lords there,[30] and of their attendance upon their lords in the great council.[31] The retainers probably were near their lords since only by their proximity could they give the advice and prestige which was their

[24] *Red Book*, II, 757.

[25] *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, III, 52. For indication of the separation of these groups see *Eadmeri historia novorum in Anglia*, p. 62, and *Symeonis Monachi opera omnia*, T. Arnold, ed. (Rolls series), I, 180.

[26] Russell, *Speculum*, XII, 324-6.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 325. "In the last resort it was the lord's military power based on enfeoffed knights which determined his influence at the king's court". F. M. Stenton, *First Century of English Feudalism* (Oxford, 1932), p. 58.

[28] Stubbs, *Select Charters*, p. 504. On at least two occasions the king is mentioned as talking secretly with his followers. *Eadmeri historia novorum in Anglia*, pp. 53-62; *Chronicon de bello*, p. 76.

[29] *Cartularium monasterii de Rameseia*, W. H. Hart, ed. (Rolls series), I, 235; G. B. Adams, *Council and Courts* (New Haven, 1926), pp. 6-7, 37-8, 61; W. A. Morris, *Constitutional History of England to 1215* (New York, 1930), p. 185. References to barons taking counsel of their followers appear in Morris, who cites *Histoire de Guillaume de Marechal*, P. Meyer, ed., lines 13376-96 and *Chronicon monasterii de Abingdon*, J. Stevenson, ed. (Rolls series), II, 20, 68.

[30] William de Insula, a knight summoned to attend William of Valence in 1258, N. Denholm-Young, "Robert Carpenter and the Provisions of Westminster", *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, L (1935), 25. For the summoning of knights to a parliament of 1258 see *Matthaei Parisiensis . . . chronica majora*, V, 695-6.

[31] "Episcopus et homines sui egrediantur", and "Egresso itaque episcopo cum suis", *Symeonis Monachi opera omnia*, I, 182, 183. Followers of Becket were with him at Northampton (*Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, I, 34; II, 331). "Per consilium regis Henrici filii sui et per consilium comitum et baronum et militum et hominum suorum", *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi*, I, 107. Mention is made of monks and "servientes" with the archbishop of Canterbury (*ibid.*, p. 113). In 1257 there is an item in a Canterbury expense account: "In exp(ensis) H. prioris et sociorum eun(tium) London. ad parlamentum in quindena Sancti Michaeli xvii lib. x sol. xi d. iii qa." Lambeth Palace MS. 242, f. 4^{r}.

reason for existence as retainers. Thus when writers speak of medieval lords in assemblies we should in most cases visualize them with their retainers, as the centers of groups rather than as isolated individuals.

The outline of the great council is beginning to emerge. It was shaped about the king and his entourage, with the archbishops of Canterbury and York to his right and left. Farther to his right were the other ecclesiastical leaders and to his left, the lay magnates. By the time that these men and their retainers had occupied positions, most of the desirable space near the eyes and ears of the king would have been taken. If other persons were present, their influence upon the meeting would have been largely nullified by their unfavorable positions. They might have left little evidence of their attendance in contemporary documents.

II

Our picture of the king, archbishops, bishops, abbots, earls, and barons shows that the chroniclers were presenting the classes as they were seated. From the charter witness lists it is clear that individuals as well as groups had definite places in the pattern of seating. These conditions were assumed by most writers, who therefore felt no need to analyze or even to state the principles underlying the seating arrangements. Chroniclers did occasionally state the theory as "everyone in his place according to his dignity (*dignitas*) and group (*ordo*)".[32] The *Modus* tells of groups (*gradus*) which sat together and in which questions of precedence might arise. This attention to rank and dignity is what might be expected of a visually minded age.

The term used of a group, *ordo,* reminds one of the "orders" of the estates general of France, which persisted until the French Revolution: the clergy, the lay nobles and knights, and the third estate, groups which sat together and acted as units in the assembly. In England *ordo* apparently could convey the same meaning in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, although usually it meant a division of the clergy.[33] The chronicles speak frequently of *clerus et populus.* The clergy was certainly an *ordo* and preserved its identity as such in convocation. Presumably the chroniclers regarded the laity (*populus*) also as an *ordo,* but in a rela-

[32] *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Hovedene,* II, 11, 248; *Flowers of History of Roger of Wendover,* H. G. Hewlett, ed. (Rolls series), I, 166; *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi,* II, 83.

[33] *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket,* III, 309; *Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury,* I, 163, II, 245, 247; J. H. Baxter and C. Johnson, *Medieval Latin Word List* (Oxford, 1934). *Ordo* was sometimes equated with *turma,* which was used to designate an army division. *Annales monastici* (Rolls series), III, 405. It was thus used much like *gradus.*

tively vague sense.[34] In any case, both divided into politically significant units which the *Modus* calls *gradus:*[35] the *clerus* into prelates and proctors, and the *populus* into earls and barons, knights of the shires, and burgesses.

A group, larger or smaller, *ordo* or *gradus,* had certain characteristics in common besides sitting together in assemblies and acting as a political unit. Its members had distinctive insignia and clothing. They often possessed special privileges and immunities, such as being tried by their own group according to its law. Becket, for instance, because of his *ordo* and *dignitas,* refused to admit the king's right to try him, asserting that an archbishop could not be tried by even a king and his court.[36] The clergy was the best organized of the *ordines* and was almost a state in itself. In England, unlike France, the noble-knight and burgess classes never developed far as special privileged political groups with separate status in the assembly.

Dignitas was the personal status of an individual in society, both within his *ordo* and outside. It gave a certain definite precedence in place and in action. In place the most honorable position at the king's court was in the center, usually on an elevation, the seat generally occupied by the king himself. The next positions below this in honor were immediately to his right and left; lesser places were farther away. In action, that is in processions and probably even in traveling, precedence was usually from first to last, although some ceremonies required a different pattern. *Dignitas* was manifested also by dress and personal retainers. Social custom limited marriage to persons of about the same *dignitas.* This conception of dignity was an integral part of medieval personality, vitally important to the individual. Thus the great chronicler Matthew Paris recalled with obvious pride that at a solemn ceremony the king, upon catching sight of him in the audience, probably among the monks of St. Albans, invited him to a more honorable position, apparently to a place in the royal entourage.[37] Another chronicler was indignant that King John had raised the unworthy Falkes de Breauté "so that he sat with princes and occupied a seat of glory".[38]

[34] In addition to the chroniclers' statements about "everyone in his place according to his dignity and group", which must include others than the clergy, the following item is to be noted: "Id autem videns comes de Arundel (stabat enim in ordine suo cum multitudine militum) postulat audientiam", *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket,* II, 339.

[35] Stubbs, *Select Charters,* p. 503; Clarke, p. 384.

[36] *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket,* II, 333.

[37] *Matthaei Parisiensis . . . chronica majora,* IV, 644. Another such seating incident is mentioned in the *Chronicon de bello* for the year 1156, p. 77.

[38] *Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury,* II, 113.

Group action was naturally affected by these ideas of *dignitas*. A man must be tried by his peers, that is, by those of approximately equal dignity. In the early fourteenth century it seems that precedence in parliament was to be regulated by the seneschal.[39] At this time also *dignitas* was affecting the idea of representation.[40] It also affected the procedure of the great council. If we may judge by two instances, speaking in the king's court was by precedence.[41] The method of decision was by weight of dignity rather than by numbers, although an approximation of the two could probably have been made by estimating the importance of a lord in terms of the number of his retainers.[42]

Not so easy for us to understand was that part of *dignitas* variously called *comitatus, chevauchée,* or *expeditio:* appearance with retainers. Indeed, we hardly have a suitable word for it. Its value rested upon the importance of personal leadership and the advantages of a personal following.[43] A visually minded age appreciated the *dignitas* of a man partially by the size of his following. The upkeep of a retinue, although costly to the lord, was part of the price which he paid for his social position. So burdensome was it to those who had to entertain them that the church regulated the number of retainers for which each dignity of churchmen might demand hospitality.[44] Of the tremendous importance of retainers we may judge by the refusal of the bishops to forego their followers even in the confidential sessions of monastic visitation because appearance without them would be a derogation of their *dignitas*.[45]

The pattern of assembly arrangement was thus rather a social than a political pattern, at least as far as the men of greater dignity were con-

[39] Stubbs, *Select Charters,* p. 504; Clarke, p. 379.

[40] The representative of the shire was expected to be a knight if possible. That is, he was among those who sat at the head of the county court on account of his precedence over the freemen. On the superior value of the opinions of the better folk in the county seat see W. A. Morris, *The Early English County Court* (Berkeley, 1926), pp. 106, 109.

[41] In 1164 the bishops of London, Winchester, Chichester (Hilary, consecrated 1146), Lincoln (Robert, 1147), Exeter (Bartholomew, 1161), and Worcester (Roger, 1163) spoke in order of precedence. *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket,* II, 326-8. In 1198 the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishops of London and Lincoln spoke in proper order. *Magna vita Sancti Hugonis,* J. F. Dimock, ed. (Rolls series), p. 249.

[42] The *maior, sanior,* or *valentior pars* which settled decisions was weighted by dignity rather than by number. On this see C. H. McIlwain, *Growth of Political Thought in the West* (New York, 1932), p. 303; G. Barraclough, "The Making of a Bishop in the Middle Ages", *Catholic Historical Review,* XIX (1933-34), 278, 297; Clarke, pp. 335-47.

[43] On the importance of this institution see Stenton, pp. 30, 58, 128, 175 ff.

[44] For the legislation of 1179 see *Flowers of History of Roger of Wendover,* I, 119-20. The burden of such hospitality is mentioned also in G. G. Coulton, *A Medieval Garner* (Cambridge, 1910), p. 193.

[45] C. R. Cheney, *Episcopal Visitation of Monasteries* (Manchester, 1931), p. 71.

cerned. It was distinctly feudal since it expressed visually the military might of a man with his retainers. Upon occasion, as at Runnymede or in 1258, the lords and their followers actually appeared in arms. We have used evidence in regard to the upper classes because of its abundance, but similar ideas of group arrangement and personal status were held by all classes of medieval society.[46] Such a pattern might be the basis of arrangement for almost any type of formal gathering. In it groups of all classes might share if they would arrange themselves by their *ordo* and *dignitas*.

III

If the social pattern of seating arrangements was a constant in constitutional development, the attendance was a variable. As Professor Powicke has written:

> No logical line can be drawn between the groups of men, the furniture and wagons which followed the king from place to place, and the Great Council of ecclesiastics, magnates, officials who gathered about him upon solemn occasions.[47]

Thus it is impossible to speak of attendance, at least before 1254, in any way which approximates our modern conception of membership. We may use Maitland's definition of parliament, "any meeting of the King's Council that has been solemnly assembled for general business",[48] and still have room for those concentrations of persons to which Professor White has called attention.[49]

One cause of the difficulty of defining the great council is its informality of procedure. Professor Adams has remarked upon this in the case of the bishop of Durham, William of St. Calais.[50] In the trials of the archbishops of Canterbury, Anselm and Thomas Becket, the two principals often sat apart, and groups of persons passed from the small array of people near the king to the larger number near the archbishop. But wherever the persons were, the arrangement was by *dignitas* and *ordo*. Similarly in the case of the council which followed the translation of St. Edward the Confessor on October 13, 1269, the chronicler states that the assembly at the translation included bishops, barons, and prominent men of the cities and boroughs, as well as a host of clergy and laity.

[46] The charter witness lists of even lesser folk reveal a marked attention to group separation and individual dignity.

[47] *Cam. Med. Hist.*, VI, 222.

[48] *Memoranda de parliamento* (Rolls series), p. lxvii.

[49] "Some Early Instances of Concentration of Representatives in England", *American Historical Review*, XIX (1914), 735-50.

[50] *Council and Courts*, pp. 52-64.

Then after this ceremony "the nobles began, as usual, to negotiate concerning the affairs of the king and kingdom *parliamentationis genere*".[51] What happened to the burgesses and others? The chronicler does not say. Are we warranted in considering that they were excluded from the second meeting? Parliament consisted of negotiations between the king and men of great dignity; lesser persons did not count for much. Parliament, as Maitland once wrote, was "rather an act than a body of persons".[52]

The act, however, did involve business which affected bodies of persons and, by medieval processes of thought, must be classified in terms of the *ordo* and *dignitas* of the persons affected. For instance, ecclesiastical matters and even trials of clerks should be the concern of the clerical *ordo*. When matters of importance were to be considered by the great council, important men, those of great *dignitas*, ought to be there. Henry II insisted upon this duty of the barons, and of the prelates as barons.[53] The general principle of the attendance at the great council was that the business of a meeting should determine the personnel of a meeting: for affairs which affected an *ordo* that *ordo* ought to be present, and for matters which involved men of a certain *dignitas* men of at least that *dignitas* should be present. This principle may be seen in other illustrations.

There is the case of William of St. Calais, bishop of Durham, who suffered what a follower called an unjust persecution.[54] The latter wrote indignantly that the groups sitting in judgment included provosts and huntsmen.[55] This assembly in his eyes lacked sufficient *dignitas* for there were probably not many nobles there. A second case is that of the trial of Thomas Becket, who, because he was archbishop of Canterbury, was entitled to be tried by an assembly as dignified as England could muster. A chronicler hostile to the king states that the king had to call in "some sheriffs, some barons of second rate dignity, and old men".[56]

[51] *Annales monastici*, IV, 226-7.

[52] *Memoranda de parliamento*, p. lxvii.

[53] "Ibi quotiens in regno meo de magnis aliquid agendum occurrit, concilia celebranda sunt et consiliis sumenda. Eo barones pro negotiis suis consilio fulciendis confluunt." J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, CXC, col. 852. Morris, *Constitutional History*, p. 303. Another statement is in the Constitutions of Clarendon, article 11. Stubbs, *Select Charters*, p. 166. It will be noticed that these statements do not exclude anyone.

[54] The story is entitled "De iniusta vexatione Willelmi Episcopi", *Symeonis Monachi opera omnia*, I, 170-95.

[55] "Rege cum suis episcopis et consulibus et vicecomitibus et prepositis et venatoribus aliisque quorumlibet officiorum in iudicio remanente." *Ibid.*, I, 183.

[56] "Evocantur quidem vicecomites et secunde dignitatis barones, antiqui dierum ut addantur et assint iudicio." *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, III, 67.

It was an ugly duty which many apparently avoided, and the king was hard put to it to present a court of even second-rate dignity. Occasionally groups considered themselves inadequate to answer the king's questions and demanded wider representation.[57] For questions of minor importance the king acted with the advice of less dignified groups.

Similarly there are instances of the summons of only a single *ordo* or of some special group. Parliament under the first three Edwards consisted much of the time of the king, the judges, and other officers who devoted their efforts to legal business of a less dignified nature.[58] For a time under these kings it seemed that a separate house of merchants might be set up.[59] Only laymen were summoned to the trial of David of Wales in 1282.[60] We shall see that suitors of county courts were summoned upon occasion when their special information was desired. The curious concentrations of representatives in the thirteenth century are also examples of the operation of the principles of assembly attendance.[61]

The variability of assembly attendance was caused, of course, by the king's need for meetings of different types to conform to current ideas of competent advisory bodies. The king, like the people, was bound strongly by the social control of custom. Nevertheless, his prerogative included considerable discretion of summons, wide enough to contain the germs of despotism. For raising money, royal experiments in personal or group solicitation persisted long after the Middle Ages as a prerogative right. In view of the growing power of royalty in Europe the prerogative constituted a distinct danger to the development of parliament.

IV

The medieval great council had as a constant its pattern of seating based upon *ordo* and *dignitas* and as a variable its attendance, which varied according to the *ordo* and *dignitas* of those affected by the busi-

[57] H. G. Richardson, Royal Historical Society, *Transactions*, 4th ser., XI, 153, citing *Curia Regis Rolls*, III, 124-7; *Flowers of History of Roger of Wendover*, III, 21; *Matthaei Parisiensis . . . chronica majora*, IV, 375-6; W. E. Lunt, "The Consent of the English Lower Clergy to Taxation during the Reign of Henry III", in *Persecution and Liberty: Essays in Honor of George Lincoln Burr* (New York, 1931), p. 129.

[58] H. G. Richardson and G. Sayles, *Rotuli parliamentorum Anglie hactenus inediti, 1279-1373* (London, 1935), pp. vii-xviii.

[59] Stubbs, *Select Charters*, p. 496. The experiment was repeated.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 456. Of the trial of the bishop of Coventry in 1194 a chronicler wrote, "Iudicaverunt . . . episcopum Coventrensem subiacere iudicio episcoporum, in eo quod episcopus erat, et iudicio laicorum in eo quod ipse vicecomes regis extiterat." *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Hovedene*, III, 242.

[61] White, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XIX, 735-50.

ness of the meeting. It is easy to show that the nobles were usually there and to indicate their precedence. With them were their retainers. When the possibility of the presence of knights who were not retainers and of burgesses and others is considered, the problem becomes more difficult. Because of their lesser *dignitas* they would have had less chance to figure in charter witness lists as individuals or to be mentioned in the chronicles as groups, just as their presence at meeting would have been of small moment to the men of greater dignity. The question of their presence is of importance, nevertheless, especially for the light which it throws upon constitutional development. If lesser people did attend with some regularity, we may say that they had an established right to do so and that the introduction of the writ system merely regularized their attendance. If they did not attend except when summoned occasionally by the king, the orthodox doctrine is correct, according to which the king added these lesser groups to a pre-existing feudal council for his own advantage.[62]

At this time there existed many local courts in England in which hundreds of lesser folk were learning self-government. Forced, perhaps unwillingly at first by the king,[63] they administered a common law under common forms of justice in addition to various local customs; "self-government at the king's command" it has been aptly called.[64] These men developed certain vested interests in the revenues and profits of government. They struggled to supplant the noble sheriff, whose *dignitas* was too great for them to control, with the knight-sheriff, who was more amenable.[65] In the county courts and borough councils they gained experience and often handled affairs of considerable importance. They even wrote manuals of legal and administrative practice.[66] To have excluded these men from participation in the great council would have resulted in the elimination of an exceedingly able group which might frequently have been needed.

[62] Clarke, p. 286; Pasquet, pp. 38, 70, and conclusion; C. Stephenson, "Taxation and Representation in the Middle Ages", *Anniversary Essays in Mediaeval History by Students of Charles Homer Haskins* (Boston, 1929), p. 311.

[63] C. A. Beard, "The Teutonic Origins of Representative Government", *American Political Science Review*, XXVI (1932), 28-44.

[64] A. B. White, *Self-Government at the King's Command* (Minneapolis, 1933).

[65] W. A. Morris, *The Mediaeval English Sheriff* (Manchester, 1927), p. 167.

[66] For Henry Bracton see G. E. Woodbine's edition of the *De legibus et consuetudinibus Angliae;* for Robert Carpenter see N. Denholm-Young, "Robert Carpenter and the Provisions of Westminster", *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, L (1935), 22-35; for John of Morbiry and John of Oxford see Josiah Cox Russell, *Dictionary of Writers of Thirteenth Century England* (London, 1936), pp. 69, 70.

The argument that lesser folk might not attend is based largely on lack of positive evidence that they did so, or on theory. The feudal system is alleged to have excluded them, although even advocates of this view concede that retainers and small tenants-in-chief were admitted and that the king by his prerogative might admit others. A plausible explanation of the paucity of references to such persons in chronicles and charter witness lists has been suggested already. The case for exclusion of lesser persons would be stronger if specific instances of expulsion for non-membership were cited.[67] With the introduction of the writ system a basis for exclusion was established. References to doorkeepers and provisions for refusal of admittance to those who had no business in parliament are mentioned in the *Modus*.[68] Against such arguments as have been advanced for the non-attendance of lesser persons before 1254 positive evidence of their presence would be conclusive. There are vague statements of the presence of large groups of persons evidently below noble status.[69] The problem is to explain them.

At the great council of 1086 the following are stated to have been present: "archiepiscopi, episcopi, abbates, comites, vicecomites cum suis militibus".[70] Presumably the chronicler had a picture in his mind of archbishops, bishops, abbots, earls, and sheriffs, each with his retainers. Knights (*milites*) who were not "men" of nobles were probably with the sheriffs of their county. But since the sheriffs of that day were mostly important lords,[71] the county knights could not be easily distinguished from those who were retainers. Within a generation after this, however, in several judicial cases before the royal court large groups of knights and freemen, suitors of specified county courts, shared in judgments.[72] Evidently they sat together and formed a non-baronial division of the assembly.

If it is true that county knights were with sheriffs, then as the shrievalty fell into the hands of non-noble persons, we should expect a

[67] The king did exclude his enemies or draw aside with his retainers at times. *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi*, I, 93; *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, I, 35, II, 331.

[68] Stubbs, *Select Charters*, p. 500; Clarke, pp. 375, 381-2.

[69] As instances: "baronibus et populi multitudine", *Chronicon de bello*, p. 85; *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi*, I, 352; "presentibus episcopis, abbatibus, clero, baronibus et populo multo", *Historical Works of Ralph de Diceto*, II, 72; "et innumera turba regni", *Flowers of History of Roger of Wendover*, I, 22.

[70] *Florentii Wigorniensis monachi chronicon*, B. Thorpe., ed. (London, 1848-49), *sub anno* 1086. The knights are also mentioned in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, C. Plummer, ed. (Oxford, 1892), I, 220.

[71] Morris, *Mediaeval English Sheriff*, pp. 41-74.

[72] Conveniently edited by M. M. Bigelow, *Placita Anglo-Normannica* (Boston, 1879), pp. 7-8, 16, 17, 20, 22-3.

separation of the sheriff-knight group from the noble-retainer group. The presence of the knights would thus be more obvious and would have better chance of being noticed in the chronicles. Notices of knight attendance do appear for the years 1170, 1176, 1177, 1189, 1198, and 1237.[73] Professor Morris has shown that the non-noble sheriff was prominent in the years 1170-89, 1194-99, and after 1224.[74] The agreement of the two series of dates is remarkable. Under the circumstances it seems probable that numbers of knights did attend but that, because of their small *dignitas*, they had little influence and received less notice.

The question of borough attendance before the writs to boroughs were issued in 1264 cannot be separated from the appearance of citizens of the leading city, London. In the time of King Stephen the archbishop of Rouen saw fit to address London's leaders as senators,[75] and they were invited to a great church council because they were "quasi optimates".[76] As early as 1215 the committee of twenty-five nobles to enforce Magna Carta upon King John included the mayor of London, and by the fourteenth century the mayor of London had upon occasion the status of an earl and the aldermen that of barons. Under the circumstances it seems probable that the leaders of London attended with some regularity. As to the attendance from other boroughs information is and naturally would be scarce. The burgesses had even less *dignitas* (except for the officials of London) than the knights. Nevertheless, occasional evidence of their attendance appears. In the Tewkesbury chronicle there is a description of an assembly of 1237 which consisted of "archbishops, bishops, abbots *and* priors; earls *and* barons; citizens *and* burgesses; and many others". The chronicler by the use of "and" deliberately set off three definite groups, one of which was that of citizens and burgesses.[77]

[73] *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi*, I, 6, 107, 160, 167; *Historical Works of Ralph a. Diceto*, I, 404; *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Hovedene*, II, 8; IV, 63; *Calendar of Close Rolls, 1234-37*, p. 545; *Matthaei Parisiensis . . . chronica majora*, V, 5.

[74] Morris, *Mediaeval English Sheriff*, pp. 113, 138, 169.

[75] "Hugo Dei gratia Rothomag. archiep. senatoribus inclitis, civibus honoratis et omnibus commune London. etc." Harley MS. 1708, f. 113[v].

[76] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis monachi de gestis regum Anglorum*, II, 576.

[77] *Annales monastici*, I, 102. The italics are mine. S. K. Mitchell, however, suggests that these citizens and burgesses were Londoners (*Studies in Taxation under John and Henry III*, New Haven, 1914, p. 215, n. 173). Since the same Tewkesbury writer says earlier in the account (*Annales monastici*, I, 97) that tallage was taken "tam a comitibus quam a baronibus, militibus, viris religiosis, civibus et burgensibus" (*i.e.*, from all of England), it seems arbitrary to assume without proof that the expression "civibus et burgensibus" on page 102 of the chronicle refers to London alone. For this chronicler's use of other terms relating to cities see pages 72, 86, 91, 111. This chronicler apparently alternated with Thomas of Kidderminster in composing the Tewkesbury chronicle. Russell, *Dictionary of Writers*, pp. 164-5.

On the clerical side the problem of the lesser folk is somewhat simpler. We have seen that both clerical and lay retainers attended their spiritual lords and probably sat near them. Clerical proctors may have attended before 1254,[78] and upon at least one occasion archdeacons were consulted as a group.[79] If other clerks attended, they would probably have sat near the bishop of their dioceses.

From this survey certain conclusions may be drawn. The first is that upon irregular occasions groups of knights, burgesses, and perhaps clerical proctors were summoned for various purposes to the king's court.[80] The second is that lesser folk did attend meetings of the great council even at other times. The third is that they had such rights in the assembly as their *ordo* and *dignitas* gave: poor positions in seating and little weight in decisions. These probably explain the remark of the annalist of Waverley when he wrote that a certain grant was made by the archbishops, bishops, abbots and priors, earls, barons, knights and free tenants of the kingdom.[81] If, as seems probable, it was becoming the custom for groups of influential knights and burgesses to attend the great council, the next step would be to regularize this attendance by writs of summons. The answer to the question of why they were summoned would then be that they were already attending, a typically medieval answer.

V

The regular use of writs for summoning representatives of the lesser folk would naturally have some effect upon parliamentary organization. As representatives they were required to answer such questions as the king might put to them. This implies separate groups and common action. Once separated from the nobles these representatives would have freer play for their ideas of parliamentary organization, ideas acquired in their rather considerable political experience in county court, borough council, and church council.

The view here presented is that the king merely intended that the writs of summons should regularize the attendance of groups which had already appeared in varying numbers. If their appearance had been in the nature of an "addition to a preexisting feudal council", it is

[78] Clarke, pp. 307-9.

[79] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis monachi de gestis regum Anglorum*, II. 574.

[80] This is outlined in Clarke, ch. XIII.

[81] *Annales monastici*, IV, 300. Mitchell (p. 161) suggests that this is a description of the taxpayers.

doubtful if Edward I would have accepted the idea so readily, especially since his enemy, Simon de Montfort, had made much use of it to restrict royal power. The attendance of groups of lesser folk was not peculiar to England and was in accord with the development of assemblies all over Europe. The tradition of long attendance at the great council may account for some of the self-confidence of the English lesser folk.

Even with their political experience the knights and burgesses might have remained passive groups, merely answering royal questions and consenting to royal demands, if they had not been imbued with an aggressive spirit for common action.[82] This feeling was embodied in the idea of the *communitas Anglie*. Their political theory tended to be expressed in such sayings as "What touches all must be approved by all".[83] At its worst it was a desire to retain vested interests in wardships, marriages, and other profitable privileges which were being given to aliens by Henry III.[84] At its best it approached an exalted form of patriotism. They had in London an example of communal leadership, and they received comfort from their veneration of a series of political saints: Thomas Becket, Stephen Langton, Edmund of Abingdon, Robert Grosseteste, Simon de Montfort, and Thomas of Lancaster, men who had upon significant occasions opposed the king successfully.[85]

The knights and burgesses thus naturally did not interpret their presence in parliament as did the king. Edward certainly did not intend to create a legislative body, that is, a body with initiative of its own to act even against the king. Since few parliaments acquired such competence, it is probable that this result was caused by conditions peculiar to England. From their later actions it appears that the knights and burgesses regarded parliament as an assembly to be organized as a kind of super county court. Professor Treharne has shown that in the middle of the thirteenth century a group of important local politicians dominated the local courts and usually represented the counties before

[82] A. B. White, "Was there a 'Common Council' before Parliament?", *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXV (1919), 11, 14.

[83] *Matthaei Parisiensis . . . chronica majora*, IV, 37. This idea is insisted upon by A. J. Carlyle, *History of Medieval Political Theory in the West* (London, 1928), V, 128.

[84] Stressed in the Song of Lewes. *The Political Songs of England*, T. Wright, ed. (London, 1839), p. 86. That government service was satisfactorily rewarded is indicated by Professor J. F. Willard in his *Parliamentary Taxes on Personal Property* (Cambridge, 1934), pp. 197-219.

[85] Josiah Cox Russell, "London and Thirteenth Century Anti-Royal Methods", *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, XII (1931), 156-68, and "The Canonization of Opposition to the King in Angevin England", *Haskins Anniversary Essays*, pp. 279-90.

the central government.[86] As we should expect, these men brought with them their own pattern of political thought.

There is apparently no evidence that knights and burgesses who attended the great council acted together as groups on their own initiative before 1259, but in that year such a group, the *communitas bachelerie,* was so acting.[87] There is some evidence that they sat together as groups. At a later date the *Modus tenendi parliamentum* pictures for us an assembly in which lesser folk composed three of the six *gradus:* the proctors of the clergy, the knights of the shires, and the burgesses. It would be reasonable to suppose that the members seated themselves according to the customary pattern of precedence.

In the county court the conception of *dignitas* as a universal idea had its influence; a knight was the superior of a freeman. Alongside of it, with the increasing legalization of the thirteenth century, was the concept of representation. The county representative had not only his own *dignitas* but also the power which representation of his county conferred upon him. This power was so great, according to the author of the *Modus,* that for assessing aids the two representatives of a county availed more than even a "greater earl", and similarly, the proctors of the clergy of a diocese, if unanimous, counted for more than their bishop.[88] Undoubtedly representation added to the *dignitas* of the representative.

These men of the *communitas Anglie* also had definite ideas about attendance at assemblies. They had shared in courts of fixed personnel, regular meetings, and wide competence.[89] Now they found themselves in assemblies in which attendance varied widely in *ordo* and *dignitas* according to the subjects under consideration at the discretion of the king. From their experience they probably knew that only by fixed personnel, by regularity of attendance and meeting, and by wide competence would it be possible to attain the permanence of policies which would restrain the arbitrary power implied in such royal discretion. In times of crisis, as in 1215, 1244, and 1258-65, the anti-royal forces gave signs of their political wisdom by selecting committees to watch the king.

The general direction of the political influences which the operation

[86] R. F. Treharne, *Barional Plan of Reform* (Manchester, 1932), p. 349. E. F. Jacob, *Studies in the Period of Baronial Reform and Rebellion* (Oxford, 1925), p. 50. Possibly these were the *buzones.* Gaillard Lapsley, "Buzones", *Eng. Hist. Rev.,* XLVII (1932), 177-93, 545-67.

[87] *Annales monastici,* I, 471; Treharne, p. 162.

[88] Stubbs, *Select Charters,* p. 504; Clarke, p. 382.

[89] Morris, *Early English County Court,* pp. 90-146.

of the county courts exerted upon Englishmen has been stated by Professor Morris as follows:

> The actual and potential democracy of the shiremote of the thirteenth century has not been carefully enough considered. General acceptance of the fact that attendance was not confined to specific social classes is recent. It demands a corresponding enlargement of ideas concerning the influence of this body upon the political education of Englishmen.[90]

VI

What was the effect of the political ideas of the lesser folk upon the organization of parliament? The question of the influence of one group upon another, where the influence is not acknowledged, is always difficult. Both may have been affected by a third force or have adopted their ideas independently. In the case of the influence of the *communitas* it can be shown that the organization of parliament did change in the direction of its ideas. Parliament became a body of fixed personnel, regular meetings, and wide competence. The English system of two houses would seem to be the result of the political unity of the *communitas* in the face of king and nobility. Political conditions after 1254 were favorable to the increase of the influence of the lesser folk and their ideas.

The frequent appearance of groups of representatives of the lower clergy, of the counties, and of the boroughs, made necessary some adjustment of their ideas of seating and attendance to those of the king and the nobility. Fortunately, all of the parties concerned had had long experience in the processes of government and were willing to learn and to compromise. The *communitas,* as it happened, found the problem of adjustment to the ideas of the king more difficult than to the ideas of the nobles.

For some time, in the latter half of the thirteenth and the early part of the fourteenth century, the nobles had been irritated, not to say dismayed, by the advance of the administrative officials,[91] who were agents of royal authority. On the other hand, the nobility's power did not seem to be threatened by the rise of the *communitas.* Indeed, the nobles were to find it an ally against the king. They were not requested by the commons to yield their precedence or disturbed in their social superiority. With the evolving of committees of the parliamentary *gradus* a convenient method of avoiding impasses in a divided assembly was found.[92]

[90] *Ibid.*, p. 145.

[91] Clarke, pp. 208-10.

[92] *Ibid.*, ch. IX.

The creation of these committees probably settled the most difficult question created by the rearrangement of the assembly. The older seating arrangement had been that of *ordo* and *dignitas,* which then broke up according to *gradus* and *dignitas.* The development of common action by groups sitting together was doubtless more important for constitutional history than the actual positions of the newer *gradus* when they all met together, especially since for much business parliament divided for deliberation. The *gradus* was a stage in parliamentary history intermediate between that of the great council and that of the bicameral legislature. The coalescence of the knights and burgesses in one house, probably the result of common interests and even more of long experience in the courts, was peculiar to England. The union was not a mere matter of the union of those of lesser *dignitas,* since the proctors of the clergy did not join them. With the proctors, *ordo* was probably more important than *dignitas:* they stayed in convocation rather than in parliament. In the bicameral parliament there were joined the judicial authority of the nobility and the political power of the commons.[93]

More important than the seating of the assembly was the commons' concept of an assembly of fixed personnel, wide competence, and regular meetings. With these ideas the nobles found little difficulty since they nearly always attended the assembly meetings anyhow. With the king it was a much more serious problem. He found his discretion limited and his ability to secure money restricted by his inability to issue writs as he desired within the limits of previous custom.

Not only were fewer irregular assemblies held, but the attendance of persons in the lesser *gradus* was becoming fairly constant even in the days of the early Edwards.[94] Furthermore, a sharp distinction was made between writ-holders and those without writs. We are not surprised to find that the *Modus* refers to a doorkeeper who questions entrants as to their business. This manual also speaks of peers of parliament, a conception in which the county and borough representative is assumed to have an approximate equality with the noble. There are present here the attributes of "membership": regular attendance, equality of members,

[93] The thesis of J. G. Edwards, "The *Plena Potestas* of English Parliamentary Representation", *Oxford Essays in Medieval History presented to Herbert Edward Salter* (Oxford, 1934), pp. 101 ff.

[94] J. G. Edwards, "The Personnel of the Commons in Parliament under Edward I and Edward II", *Essays in Medieval History presented to Thomas Frederick Tout,* edited by A. G. Little and F. M. Powicke (Manchester, 1925), p. 197 f. M. McKisack, *Parliamentary Representation of the English Borough in the Middle Ages* (London, 1932).

and exclusion of non-members from participation. The author of the *Modus* held some very modern political opinions; a good deal of time was to pass before these ideas were to be generally accepted.

The approach to the development of parliament by its organization, particularly by seating and attendance, has led to certain definite results. The twelfth century assembly sat by *ordo* and *dignitas* and was attended according to the *ordo* and *dignitas* of those affected by the business in hand. This explains how the great men dominated the discussions and decisions and why they bulk large in the evidence of the meetings. It explains also why lesser folk might have been present but unimportant and relatively unnoticed. Into this assembly the use of writs permitted the energetic representatives of the *communitas* to enter, no longer as hangers-on but as groups which sat and deliberated together. From the lower courts they brought ideas of regular meetings, fixed personnel, and wide competence for the assembly. In the adjustment which followed in the fourteenth century many of these ideas were gradually accepted. *Ordines* gave way, first to *gradus* and then to houses; *dignitas* persisted as the basis of precedence. Royal discretion in determining attendance by summons dwindled as the idea of fixed membership grew. To our modern mind the latter state of organization is more comprehensible than the earlier. We can appreciate Walter Map's wit when he wrote of the twelfth century court, "I speak of the curia, but I do not know, God knows, what the curia is".[95]

Josiah Cox Russell.

The University of North Carolina.

[95] "De curia loquor et nescio, Deus scit, quid sit curia." This is quoted by G. B. Adams on the title page of his *Council and Courts*.

THE DIPLOMATIC REVOLUTION OF 1854

I

The Four Points

The period of the Crimean War saw the final breakdown of that peculiar European Concert established by the statesmen of 1815. There had for many years been symptoms that the system then established was disintegrating; but it had achieved some notable successes. During 1840 and 1841, for example, the Straits question was settled without serious conflict. The system of 1815, in fact, seemed to work best when performing its original function, that of holding France in check. This "system of the Emperor Nicholas, to which Europe was indebted for thirty years of peace",[1] was not exactly a European Concert. It was in essence a permanent alliance between Russia, Prussia, and Austria, based on a community of political interests—monarchy as against liberalism—rather than on common interests in foreign affairs. All these powers were interested in maintaining the *status quo*,[2] however, and were in general opposed not only to revolution but to any ambitious foreign policy. Three powers out of five, united in such a cause, were a constant guarantee against disturbances of the peace. There was at least an embryonic Concert of Europe.

This co-operation of the three eastern powers, to which the name "Holy Alliance" still clung, perhaps reached its height in 1849, when Russia intervened to help the Habsburg monarchy to put down the Hungarian rebels, and when Palmerston declined to support them. At Olmütz, in the following year, the predominance of Russia was too plainly demonstrated to the whole of Europe. Many Austrian statesmen felt that, in spite of the inestimable services rendered by Russia to Austria—perhaps because of these very services—Austria was in danger of becoming little better than a Russian vassal. They therefore determined that this process should go no further; and when in 1853 the czar took Austrian co-operation for granted, he was disillusioned. During

[1] Saburov's report of the conference of Jan. 24, 1880, J. Y. Simpson, *The Saburov Memoirs* (Cambridge, 1929), p. 120. The words quoted are Bismarck's.

[2] This was true, after 1828-29, even of Russian policy towards Turkey. See Memoranda of Daschkov and Nesselrode, F. F. Martens, *Recueil de traités et conventions conclus par la Russie avec les puissances étrangères* (St. Petersburg, 1878), IV[1], 438-9. Though Turkey was to be maintained, she was not to be allowed to strengthen herself; see C. W. Crawley, *The Question of Greek Independence* (Cambridge, 1930), p. 124.

1854 Austria drifted further away from Russia, until, on December 2d, she aligned herself with Russia's enemies in a definite treaty. The result was the disappearance of the last relics of the system of 1815. It was a diplomatic revolution more far-reaching in its effects than that of Kaunitz. No longer were there three powers in favor of the maintenance of the *status quo;* no longer was there any European Concert, even in embryo. The way was paved for the great events of little more than a decade, during which Bismarck unified Germany, Cavour unified Italy, and Napoleon III led France towards the disasters of 1870 and 1871.

The breakdown of the alliance between Russia, Austria, and Prussia, which rendered possible these stirring events, has been strangely neglected by historians. Interest has principally centered on the questions: Who was responsible for the Crimean War?, and, to a smaller extent, Did Britain "back the wrong horse"? These questions are full of difficulties: the first, because conclusions have tended to be negative, that this or that man or country was not specially responsible, and the second, because it defies final decision and must always remain largely a matter of opinion. Attention has been diverted by these problems from the negotiations that took place during the Crimean War and from the diplomatic revolution that accompanied them. It is proposed to glance at this subject here.

During 1853 Czar Nicholas made persistent efforts to secure Austrian backing on the Eastern Question, as his quarrel with France and Britain grew more and more bitter. He first tried to persuade Franz Josef to occupy Bosnia and Herzegovina, thus committing Austria to the same policy as Russia, which had just occupied the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia. When this failed he tried to bind Austria and Prussia to a friendly neutrality. "Devrons-nous rester forts, à nous trois", he wrote to Franz Josef, "en face des dangers communs qui nous menacent; ou bien cette antique alliance, héritage de nos prédécesseurs, qui assura le bonheur de l'Europe depuis 40 ans, doit-elle disparaître à jamais, pour faire place à la plus terrible des confusions?"[3] In pursuit of this policy Nicholas dispatched Orlov to Vienna in January, 1854. Orlov was a man of most conciliatory disposition,[4] but his instructions were definite:

[3] Nicholas to Franz Josef, Jan. 4/16, 1854. Hanns Schlitter, *Aus der Regierungszeit Kaiser Franz Josef I* (Vienna, 1919), pp. 99-100.

[4] The choice of Orlov to carry the czar's words seemed to Metternich the one hopeful symptom. Metternich to Buol, Jan. 27, 1854; C. J. Burckhardt, *Briefe des Fürsten Metternich an den Grafen Buol-Schauenstein, 1852-1859* (Munich, 1934), pp. 153-4.

Austria, out of gratitude for Russia's intervention in 1849, was to declare herself benevolently neutral if war broke out. Franz Josef replied that he could do this only if Nicholas would formally guarantee him the maintenance of the *status quo* in the Balkans.[5] Orlov said that this was impossible. It implied, in fact, that Austria desired to paralyze Russian military operations at the very moment that the Western powers were entering the Black Sea and paralyzing Russian naval operations.[6] Orlov thus left Vienna without success, and a similar mission to Berlin also failed. Nicholas's refusal to guarantee the Turkish *status quo* left a bad impression with Franz Josef, who declared that this was in contradiction to Nicholas's previous statements of policy.[7] Franz Josef now verged more and more towards the anti-Russian views of Buol and Hübner, Bruck and Prokesch-Osten.[8] These views, though differing among themselves, agreed on one point: Russia was Austria's natural enemy in the Balkans, and the coming conflict must therefore be used to Austria's advantage. Austrian military men, however, were on the whole favorable to Russia,[9] and Franz Josef's views were sometimes liable to vacillation. Nicholas therefore refused to believe that Austria's policy was really hostile until he received a rude shock in the shape of the Austrian demand, dated June 3, 1854, that Russia should evacuate the principalities. Before that, he thought that the Austrian policy was merely "to leave us in doubt and thus to do us injury".[10]

The enemies of Russia did not share the obstinate blindness of Nicholas and were quick to attempt to draw Austria into closer alliance with themselves. In February and March, 1854, negotiations were undertaken by which Britain and France and Austria and Prussia were to sign a treaty demanding Turkish integrity and the evacuation of the principalities.[11] The project proved unsuccessful, owing to the attitude

[5] Orlov to Nesselrode, Jan. 22/Feb. 3, 1854, No. II, A. M. Zaïonchkovskii, *Vostochnaya Voina, 1853-1856* (St. Petersburg, 1908-13), Documentary Appendix, II, 268.

[6] *Ibid.*, No. I, pp. 265-6.

[7] Conversation with Meyendorff, Russian minister in Vienna, Feb. 21, 1854, Heinrich Friedjung, *Der Krimkrieg und die oesterreichische Politik* (Stuttgart, 1911), p. 19.

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 22-36. This work is poorly documented; it has some inaccuracies and many omissions. Nevertheless it is still the soundest exposition of these transactions from the Austrian side. Buol-Schauenstein was Austrian foreign minister. Hübner was minister in Paris, Bruck in Constantinople, and Prokesch-Osten in Frankfurt.

[9] Some Austrian soldiers showed anti-Russian tendencies, *e.g.*, Archduke Albrecht and General Ramming. *Ibid.*, pp. 38-9.

[10] Nicholas to Paskiewitch, May 11, 1854, Theodor Schiemann, *Geschichte Russlands unter Kaiser Nikolaus I* (Berlin, 1904-19), IV, 316.

[11] Westmorland to Clarendon, Feb. 23, 1854, No. 6 (Public Record Office, Foreign Office, 7/432) encloses a "Project of Convention".

of Frederick William IV of Prussia, who was still trying to arrange a peace. Austria, though she formally supported the allied ultimatum demanding the evacuation of the principalities, dared not envisage the prospect of a hostile Prussia on her flank. So France and Britain alone declared war on Russia on March 31, 1854. The hope that the European Concert, anti-French in intention since 1815, would re-establish itself in an anti-Russian sense, was now manifestly disappearing. In the West, France and Britain were in alliance, and fighting Russia in the East. In the center, Austria and Prussia, feeling their isolation, signed a treaty on April 20.[12] Prussia engaged to defend Austria against Russian attack, which she knew would not be forthcoming; but no offensive policy was to be pursued unless Russia incorporated the principalities or attacked the Balkans. It proved impossible to persuade Prussia to go further until late in November. Prussia attended no more ambassadorial conferences at Vienna after May 23, and the diplomatic union of the four powers was definitely broken. The position now was that Austria and Prussia had refused to support Russia, and that the old "Holy Alliance" had thus for the moment ceased to operate. But they had equally refused to co-operate with France and Britain, and no new diplomatic orientation had taken place. Henceforward the chief diplomatic activity consisted of the efforts of the Western powers to draw Austria into the war, and the efforts of Austria to end the war by wringing concessions out of Russia without herself fighting.

Austria's objects during the Crimean War may conveniently be divided into positive and negative objects. Austria had refused to compromise with Russia and secure for herself a "sphere of influence" which Nicholas had been willing to offer. She had therefore a positive interest in preventing a Russian domination of the Balkans that would be dangerous to her. Palmerston understood this and declared that the Russians would never get to Constantinople—Austria would step in before it came to that.[13] But Austria's wonted dilatoriness here seemed to be serving her well. Britain and France having drifted into war, Austria was well pleased to see her battles being fought by others and displayed a natural reluctance to enter the war herself. Franz Josef later confessed that "it may sound inhuman, but the longer they go on killing each other in the Crimea, the more we may count on having peace".[14] Nevertheless, in June and July, 1854, Austria showed herself

[12] Text of treaty, *Parliamentary Papers*, Eastern Papers, IX.

[13] Palmerston to Newcastle, June 16, 1854, Evelyn Ashley, *Life and Correspondence of Henry John Temple, Viscount Palmerston* (London, 1879), II, 299.

[14] Franz Josef to Albert of Saxony, Aug. 18, 1855, Otto Ernst, *Franz Josef as*

prepared to fight in order to secure the Russian evacuation of the principalities and the freedom of the Danube. These principles of policy were Austrian, not German; hence, in her positive interests, Austria went part of the way with the Western powers and diverged from Prussia and the rest of Germany. It was by emphasizing these interests that France and Britain hoped to draw Austria into their camp.

Austria's chief negative interest was to restrict the war territorially and in its aims. During the war none of the combatants was ever in serious danger, but had Austria entered it, she would at once have been engaged in a struggle for existence. A trial by combat in the remote Crimea was very different from great-power warfare on a grand scale. Austria had been four times defeated by the first Napoleon, the very basis of her society had been shaken. She had no desire to experience another European upheaval, especially so soon after the revolutions of 1848, whether the third Napoleon were her enemy or her friend. Prussia, which lived in fear of a new Napoleonic march on the Rhine, shared Austria's anxiety to localize the war and limit its aims. On June 3, 1854, Austria demanded that Russia should evacuate the principalities and so had reason to fear a Russian declaration of war.[15] It therefore became essential for her to secure a definition and limitation of the allied war aims lest she should be drawn into an interminable struggle, in which (if it became general) she could not but be a loser. This, with a guarantee by France of her Italian possessions as a subsidiary aim, became the chief object of Austrian diplomacy during June and July, 1854. And as a natural corollary she demanded the offensive-defensive alliance of France and Britain in case she should find herself at war with Russia.

Meanwhile in France the able foreign minister, Drouyn de Lhuys, was convinced that a cordial Franco-Austrian alliance was essential for French diplomatic stability. He saw too that such an alliance would shatter "the system of the Emperor Nicholas" and alter the balance of power much to France's advantage. He recognized in Austria's anxiety for a definition of war aims a way of accomplishing this diplomatic

revealed by his Letters, tr. by Agnes Blake (London, 1927), p. 220. Compare the remark of Andlaw, Baden minister to Vienna, that in Germany "man fühlte wohl instinktmässig, dass eine Fehde, in der sich zwei der uns feindseligsten, auf unsere Grenzen drückenden Mächte gegenseitig schwächen, nicht gerade als eine vaterländische Calamität anzusehen sei". Franz Freiherr von Andlaw, *Mein Tagebuch 1811 bis 1861* (Frankfurt a. M., 1862), II, 225.

[15] Nicholas for some time seriously thought of war with Austria; and for the first time it was declared that the Russian route to Constantinople lay through Vienna. Friedjung, pp. 64-5.

revolution. Conversations therefore took place in Paris at the beginning of July between Drouyn de Lhuys, Thouvenel, and Hübner, and from them emerged an elementary form of the famous "four points", bases of peace which, after many vicissitudes, formed the foundation of the settlement of 1856.[16] France hardly played the part of a good ally, for she presented Britain with the *fait accompli* of certain bases of peace drawn up in conjunction with Austria; but she was sufficiently tactful to present them as Austrian in origin, though fully concurred in by France. Drouyn de Lhuys proposed to Britain that these potential peace terms might be committed to a protocol and signed at Vienna. Clarendon, the British foreign secretary, was already highly suspicious of Buol's proceedings and declared that "we must not get entangled in negotiations".[17] On July 19 the British cabinet spent five hours in anxious consideration of the French protocol scheme and decided against "entering into the consideration of the precise terms upon which peace might be made".[18] There seems to have been no quarrel with the substance of the French protocol. Clarendon commended its "firm tone",[19] and on July 22 a primitive form of the four points was laid down in a dispatch to Westmorland, British ambassador in Vienna.[20] The objection was not to the points themselves but to their incorporation in a binding instrument, which would hamper British freedom in future negotiations. Westmorland was naturally puzzled and wrote: "I consider Clarendon as in the worst of dilemmas; the Press and public voice and Opposition are calling out for impossible things, and he and his associates have not the power to resist it; so now they send conditions, and yet don't say they will treat upon them."[21]

[16] Thouvenel was the political director at the French foreign office. Hübner was the Austrian ambassador in Paris and was acting in close collaboration with Buol-Schauenstein, the Austrian foreign minister. It is not clear whether these transactions began with Drouyn or with Hübner, but the idea was in any case French in the sense that it emerged from secret negotiations undertaken in Paris.

[17] Clarendon to Aberdeen, July 13, 1854, *Selections from the Correspondence of George, Earl of Aberdeen* (privately printed, 1885; henceforward cited as *Aberdeen Correspondence*), Vol. 1854-55, p. 169.

[18] Aberdeen to the queen, July 19, 1854, *ibid.*, p. 174.

[19] Clarendon to the queen, July 18, 1854, Royal Archives, Windsor Castle, G. 15. I gratefully acknowledge the gracious permission of His Majesty the King to make use of unpublished material from the Royal Archives.

[20] Clarendon to Westmorland, July 22, 1854, No. 248, F. O. 7/429. A similar dispatch was sent on the same day by Drouyn de Lhuys to Bourqueney.

[21] Westmorland to Lady Westmorland, July 28, 1854, *The Correspondence of Priscilla, Countess of Westmorland*, ed. by her daughter, Lady Rose Weigall (London, 1909), p. 233.

At this point matters were complicated by a scheme for a triple alliance between Austria, France, and Britain. As early as July 9 Hübner had written to Buol recommending *"un traité* par lequel les puissances s'engageraient à consacrer tous leurs moyens d'action au but commun, dont le mimimun se trouve défini par les quatre points." [22] Hübner was acting in close collaboration with the French, and Cowley, British minister in Paris, soon noticed that Buol "had been pressed, through M. de Hübner, by M. Drouyn de Lhuys, to sign a treaty".[23] This is therefore another instance of France collaborating with Austria, behind the back of her allied belligerent, Britain. On July 24 Hübner received the order to enter into *pourparlers* with Drouyn concerning a treaty. But Buol's instruction was guarded with a very important reservation. Metternich characterised Buol as "a knife with a sharp point but with no edge"; [24] and Hübner noted, in a moment of exasperation, that Buol always left "une petite porte ouverte pour les cas très fréquents où il serait obligé de reculer".[25] Buol's little door on this occasion was the statement that the proposal contained only his personal impressions and was in no way binding upon Austria.[26] On this unsatisfactory basis Drouyn de Lhuys drew up a draft treaty of triple alliance, founded on Buol's dispatches to Hübner. He also persisted in his endeavor to attach Austria to the four points, by incorporating them in some binding instrument. He therefore proposed an exchange of notes which, since it eliminated the necessity for a conference, would be more palatable to the British taste than a protocol.[27] The whole series of documents was communicated to Clarendon by Baudin, the French chargé d'affaires, on July 26, 1854, and at about the same time they were forwarded to Vienna.

The separate negotiation between France and Austria on the sub-

[22] Lettre particulière, Hübner to Buol, July 9, 1854, Hübner, *Neuf ans de souvenirs d'un ambassadeur d'Autriche* (Paris, 1905-08), I, 253.

[23] Cowley to Clarendon, July 27, 1854, No. 937, F. O. 27/1019.

[24] Quoted by Frederick Ferdinand, count von Beust, *Memoirs written by Himself*, tr. by Henry de Worms (London, 1887), I, 104-5.

[25] May 14, 1854, Hübner, I, 237. In fairness to Buol it must be added that his tortuous policy was largely the result of the constant danger of disavowal by Franz Josef.

[26] Cowley to Clarendon, July 27, 1854, No. 937, F. O. 27/1019; Buol to Colloredo, Aug. 9, 1854, No. 2, Vienna, Haus- Hof- und Staatsarchiv (henceforward cited as "Vienna"), Politische Archiv, England VIII, fasc. 41.

[27] Britain by this time agreed to the substance of the four points. Clarendon on July 25 referred to them as "the 4 points on which the 3 powers have already agreed" (Clarendon to the queen, July 25, 1854, Royal Archives, G. 15). What was objected to was not the points themselves but the principle of binding the country to them.

ject of an alliance involving Britain was a distinct *mauvais procédé*. Buol specifically instructed Colloredo, Austrian minister in London, to say nothing about it, for he wished his own share in the preliminaries to appear trivial. On July 26 Hübner wrote urgently to Colloredo: "Lord Cowley m'a demandé pourquoi V. E. avait vis-à-vis Lord Clarendon gardé le silence au sujet du projet de traité à trois."[28] Colloredo thereupon approached Clarendon, who already knew of the project from a French source, and who expressed his dissatisfaction in vigorous terms. When Colloredo explained the motive of his silence, Clarendon retorted that "puisque c'est par la France seule qu'il a eu connaissance de ce projet . . . c'est également avec la France qu'il traitera de son exécution".[29] Colloredo was much concerned and suggested that a dispatch might be sent to mollify Clarendon.[30] The incident is in itself trivial, but it illustrates how Buol's oversubtle diplomacy tended to overreach itself, and the growing suspicion of Clarendon that he was in danger of being lured into a scheme for concluding an unsatisfactory peace.

The drafts of the proposed tripartite treaty, though they led to nothing at this period, are nevertheless worthy of study, since, after four months of almost continuous negotiation, they culminated in the treaty of December 2, 1854. The draft treaty as agreed upon by France and Austria declared roughly: (i) no negotiations shall be entered into with Russia except in concert and on the basis of the four points; (ii) Austria shall occupy the principalities; (iii) if war between Austria and Russia shall result, the Western powers promise Austria their armed support; and (iv) the accession of other European courts shall be invited to the present treaty. The original Austrian suggestion had proposed negotiations on the terms of peace to be offered to Russia. This did not figure in the French draft, presumably because it was known that Britain would not consent to such a clause. The Austrians made no objection to this important modification, and the draft treaty as a whole confirms

[28] Cipher dispatch, July 26, 1854, received in London on July 28. Enclosed in Colloredo to Buol, July 28, 1854, No. 81 C, Vienna, England VIII, fasc. 40.

[29] Colloredo to Buol, *ibid.*

[30] Lettre particulière, Colloredo to Buol, July 28, 1854, *ibid.*, fasc. 41. The conciliatory dispatch suggested by Colloredo was duly sent (Buol to Colloredo, Aug. 9, 1854, No. 2, *ibid.*). Buol explained that the project was French in origin, and he therefore thought it right that the first overture should come from France. Clarendon accepted the explanation, and "il me répéta qu'il avait precédémment entièrement ignoré que ce projet eut été conçu à Paris" (Colloredo to Buol, Aug. 19, 1854, No. 86 C, *ibid.*, fasc. 40).

the fact, known from the disposition of Austrian troops[31] and other sources, that the Vienna cabinet was at this date prepared to fight to secure a Russian retreat from the principalities. In return, a definition of war aims was demanded: Austria had to be sure that she was embarking on an old-fashioned war for the balance of power, and that she was privy to no "theory of nationalities". She also demanded security at home and hinted that "the dominions of Austria in Italy shall be guaranteed to her".[32] As early as July all the proposals were being discussed that ultimately led to the conventions of December, 1854.

On July 29 the British cabinet considered the proposed treaty and exchange of notes. With two minor alterations in the treaty, they were accepted; but Hübner noted that "les dispositions du Cabinet anglais sont évidemment tièdes".[33] At best the treaty might encourage Austria to adopt a hostile attitude towards Russia; at worst it could do no harm. Moreover, the scheme of making the four points into a binding diplomatic instrument, rejected by the cabinet on July 19, was accepted on July 29 only because it was a necessary preliminary to the tripartite treaty. The French drafts were also accepted in Vienna, and on August 1 Westmorland was writing in great delight that "Buol agrees to proposed Notes and Treaty, in short, buckles to everything".[34] On August 2 Hübner was noting this "grande nouvelle", adding that "à Londres on demande des modifications insignifiantes et inutiles".[35] But at this very moment, when Austria seemed about to cross the Rubicon, an event occurred that deprived the treaty of all its attractions for her: the Russians began to evacuate the principalities.[36] On August 1 Westmorland's son wrote that "Buol has a report (seemingly authentic) of the retreat of the Russians from Wallachia. If it be true, they are taking this step very ungraciously, without any communication to the people here."[37] Buol was not taken by surprise, having had earlier

[31] Described by F. A. M. P. Wimpffen in his *Errinerungen aus der Walachei während der Besetzung durch die oesterreichischen Truppen in den Jahren 1854-1856* (Vienna, 1878, first published in the *Oesterreichische Revue*, 1864-67).

[32] Cowley to Clarendon, July 27, 1854, No. 937, F. O. 27/1019. In this important dispatch the whole of the Austrian demands are summarized.

[33] Cipher telegram, Hübner to Buol, July 30, 1854, 5 p. m., Vienna, Frankreich IX, fasc. 45.

[34] Westmorland to Lady Westmorland, Aug. 1, 1854, *Correspondence of Lady Westmorland*, p. 234.

[35] Hübner, I, 261.

[36] "Am 27 Juli begannen die definitiven Rückzugbewegungen in umfassender weise". Wimpffen, p. 88. The news, of course, would take some time to reach Vienna in an authentic form.

[37] Julian Fane to Lady Westmorland, Aug. 1, 1854, *Correspondence of Lady Westmorland*, p. 235.

indications from Valentin Esterházy, Austrian minister in St. Petersburg, that the Russians were likely to retreat.[38] But Buol evidently had to wait until he was certain that the retreat was to be peaceful and complete. To gain time he therefore raised technical objections to the trivial modifications proposed by the British cabinet on July 29. The French government was distracted by this news. On August 2 Baudin called on Aberdeen "to impart his grief" and urged the abandonment of the British modifications.[39] Drouyn de Lhuys at the same time put pressure on Cowley to secure the consent of the British cabinet to the treaty in its original form,[40] and at Vienna the French ambassador Bourqueney proposed that he and Westmorland should write to Clarendon "to force an agreement".[41] The simple-minded Westmorland believed that the British alterations had raised some real difficulty, but clearly this does not supply the true motive of the swift change in Austrian policy. The unofficial news that the Russian troops were evacuating the principalities gave the Vienna cabinet a real hope of winning its point without incurring the dangers of war. The treaty of offensive-defensive alliance, which had seemed a very present help in time of trouble, was instantly converted into a menace—a means by which Austria might be drawn, against her will, from her neutrality.

On August 5 Buol announced to Bourqueney and Westmorland that Austria would sign the treaty only when it became clear that the Russians were *not* going to evacuate the principalities. Though Buol had carefully refrained from committing his government to the treaty, his attitude was bitterly resented by the allied ambassadors; they "objected most strongly to this delay, and the French ambassador refused to sign the notes" which incorporated the four points.[42] The French government did not adopt so decided an attitude as its ambassador. Drouyn told Cowley that he "approved the proceedings of M. de Bourqueney, who hoped by this refusal to induce the Austrian government to sign the two instruments at the same time. . . . Nevertheless, His Excellency is so much alive to the advantages of the Alliance which he conceives must result from the exchange of Notes, that having ascer-

[38] Esterházy to Buol, June 21, 1854, No. 55 A-C, and July 6, No. 60 B, Vienna, Russland X, fasc. 35.

[39] Aberdeen to Clarendon, Aug. 2, 1854, *Aberdeen Correspondence*, Vol. 1854-55, p. 185.

[40] Cowley to Clarendon, Aug. 3, 1854, No. 969, F. O. 27/1020.

[41] Westmorland to Lady Westmorland, Aug. 3, 1854, *Correspondence of Lady Westmorland*, pp. 235-6.

[42] Cipher telegram and dispatch No. 292, Westmorland to Clarendon, Aug. 5, 1854, F. O. 7/435.

tained that Lord Westmorland was to follow the instructions sent to the French Minister in this matter, he has authorised M. de Bourqueney to exchange the Notes without signing the Treaty."[43] It was in these circumstances that Britain was led or driven into a formal agreement upon the four points. She had rejected such a project on July 19 and consented on July 29 only because it formed part of a larger transaction which might bring about the active co-operation of Austria. When the treaty fell to the ground Drouyn de Lhuys took advantage of the fact that Westmorland had orders to follow Bourqueney, to commit Britain nonetheless to the four points. In this instance, as in several others, control of British policy seems to have fallen almost entirely from the hands of the listless Aberdeen ministry—to be picked up and wielded by the energetic Drouyn.

On August 8 the Russian ambassador, Gortschakov, told Buol that the czar had ordered the complete evacuation of the principalities. Buol nevertheless told the allied ambassadors that he was prepared to proceed immediately to the exchange of notes. Gortschakov's words provided him with a valid reason for refusing to sign the tripartite treaty—"it could not be signed in its present form, as it was founded upon the resistance of the Emperor to the evacuation of the Principalities . . . but he added that circumstances might very soon occur which might render necessary an act of a similar nature".[44] On August 8, therefore, Austrian diplomacy had secured a double triumph. Gortschakov's announcement meant that Austria's interests in the Balkans were safe and had been secured without war. Moreover, not only was she about to limit the war territorially by thrusting her troops between Russia and Turkey-in-Europe, but also, by the four points, she had limited the war in its objects.

These four points, to which Britain was now committed despite herself, suffered from lack of clarity, but they at least provided some rough indication of the terms upon which the allies might be expected to make peace.[45] They fell into some contempt before the end of the war, and there has ever since been a tendency to regard them as little more than diplomatic word-spinning. It is to be remembered, however, that an exchange of notes is an internationally binding instrument—the documents of August 8 lacked nothing in theoretical validity. They were

[43] Cowley to Clarendon, Aug. 7, 1854, No. 980, F. O. 27/1020.

[44] Cipher telegram, Westmorland to Clarendon, Aug. 8, 1854, F. O. 7/435.

[45] The notes are to be found in draft form in the State Papers Domestic, France, F. O. 27/1039. The final form is attached to Westmorland to Clarendon, Aug. 8, 1854, No. 293, F. O. 7/435. They are printed in *Parliamentary Papers*, Eastern Papers, XI.

also of great practical importance, forming the basis upon which peace was ultimately made. When a member of the British cabinet declared, "No words can express the sense of utter weariness with which, during many months, we used to hear the diplomatic rubbish that circled round the discussion of those Four Points",[46] he was voicing a sturdy masculine sentiment, a desire for action rather than words. But such a point of view scarcely suggests that the British cabinet understood that it was only through these same four points that peace could be made, unless the allies gained far greater military successes than could be expected. The four points, as expressed in the notes of August 8, declared: "the three Powers are equally of opinion that the relations of the Sublime Porte with the Imperial Court of Russia cannot be re-established on solid and durable bases" (i) if the Russian guarantee of the principalities be not replaced by a European guarantee; (ii) if the Danube be not "freed"; (iii) if "the Treaty of 1841 be not revised in concert by all the High Contracting Powers in the interest of the Balance of Power in Europe"; and (iv) if the Christian peoples of the Porte be not placed under European rather than under Russian protection. No negotiation was to take place with Russia save on these points. France and Britain reserved the right to demand further guarantees if circumstances warranted, but, unless the four points were entirely meaningless, these further guarantees could result only from an *interpretation* of them and could not be entirely new. Austria admitted that there might be a few minor demands in the Baltic and in Asia, but she had every right to regard the four points as a real "crystallization" of the allied demands in the Near East.

Austria had now partly aligned herself with France and Britain. The diplomatic revolution, however, was only half accomplished. Britain and France regarded the definition of their war aims as a concession which Austria should repay by participating in the war. The Austrians, for their part, considered that the allies should be grateful for the Russian evacuation of the principalities. Moreover, from the allied point of view, the transaction of August 8 was incomplete: an essential half of it, the tripartite treaty, had fallen to the ground. The next four months produced successive draft treaties by which the allies strove to force Austria to complete the transaction which the exchange of notes had begun. These efforts and the treaty of December 2 in which they culminated are now to be considered.

[46] George Douglas, eighth duke of Argyll (1823-1900), *Autobiography and Memoirs*, ed. by the Dowager Duchess of Argyll (London, 1906), I, 484.

II

Negotiation of the Treaty of December 2, 1854

No sooner had the four points attained international importance by the exchange of notes than Austria communicated them to Russia. This communication was not transmitted in the form of an ultimatum, much to the disappointment of the Western powers, who had, however, no right to expect that it would be presented in such a form. Their disappointment would have been greater had they known the precise wording of Buol's dispatches. Buol promised that, if the points were accepted, Russia "pourrait compter sur notre empressement d'adresser aux Cours Maritimes les plus serieuses représentations afin de les déterminer à consentir sans délai à l'ouverture de négociations sur ces mêmes bases et à s'entendre sur une suspension simultanée des opérations militaires". He added that Franz Josef was so confident of Russia's good intentions that "Sa Majesté a donné *sur le champ* l'ordre à une partie de ses armées de s'arrêter, et Elle s'occupe même de plans de dislocation plus étendus." In a private letter to Esterházy Buol emphasized the advantages that Russia would derive from accepting the points.

> "Du moment qu'elle se serait prononcée pour l'acceptation et que les cours maritimes feraient des difficultés, tout le blâme retomberait sur ces dernières et nos relations politiques avec elles subiraient comme de raison dès ce moment un changement très notable. On peut compter que des vues ambitieuses et des prétentions exagerées de leur part ne trouveraient jamais de l'appui chez nous."[47]

These sentences are an accurate description of the policy to which Austria adhered in August, 1854, and to which she continued to adhere. They show why the new alignment of France, Britain, and Austria—now in the making—could never have the stability and staying power of the old alignment of Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

Meanwhile Drouyn de Lhuys, having made as much as possible of the notes of August 8, at once took up the broken threads of negotiation for the tripartite treaty. While Austria assured Russia that the maritime powers might be drawn into peace, the maritime powers assured each other that Austria might be drawn into war. Drouyn was warmly backed by Clarendon in his treaty-making endeavors. Clarendon instructed Westmorland to press for a tripartite treaty and informed him "that the Governments of England and France are will-

[47] Buol to Esterházy, Aug. 10, 1854, No. 1 and No. 3 and private letter, Vienna, Russland X, fasc. 36.

ing to agree that the conditions attained in the Note . . . shall be regarded as the Bases of Negotiation with Russia".[48] Drouyn commented that this accorded with his own original proposition, which had then been rejected by Britain, and added that he would at once draw up a draft treaty.[49] Britain's change of front has a double explanation. First, Austria was chiefly interested in the principalities, which Russia was now evacuating. Hence more tempting bait would have to be offered if Austria were to be drawn from her neutrality. Secondly, the Crimean expedition, long decided upon between France and Britain, was on the point of sailing. The adventurous nature of this expedition made Austrian aid, whether by actual war or by menacing troop movements, all the more necessary. Austria, on the contrary, looked with jaundiced eye on the departure of the allied troops to a remote peninsula, where they would be of no use to her in case it came to war. Hence, as the allies became more eager, Austria became more elusive. The British cabinet entirely failed to understand the Austrian position, and a month later Clarendon was capable of sending the following hysterical telegram to Westmorland: "Austria is at this moment rendering the greatest service to Russia, and we have a right to expect that she should employ means, military or otherwise, to prevent the Russian army from being sent to attack us in the Crimea."[50] It is scarcely necessary to notice that the "right" here stated is unknown to the law of nations.

The moment was therefore unpropitious for the busy treaty drafting into which Drouyn de Lhuys now plunged. The French and British governments soon agreed on a draft, but, as soon as the idea was mooted, Hübner, who was generally favorable to such projects, declared that his government was unlikely to accept it.[51] Instead, the Austrians were busily arranging their occupation of the principalities and withdrawing some of their troops from the Polish frontier.[52] The Austrian retreat from the compromising position with the Western powers, foreshadowed by the rejection of the tripartite treaty in the

[48] Clarendon to Westmorland, Aug. 15, 1854, No. 262, F. O. 7/429. It was added that this was only "upon the express understanding, however, that they are not parties to the transmission of these conditions to St. Petersburg, and that hostilities are not to be suspended until the Preliminaries of Peace are signed".

[49] Cowley to Clarendon, Aug. 14, 1854, Royal Archives, G. 16.

[50] Sept. 18, 1854, F. O. 7/429.

[51] Cowley to Clarendon, Aug. 14, 1854, Royal Archives, G. 16.

[52] Friedjung, p. 83. This was no doubt part of the "dislocation" promised to the Russians by Buol on August 10, 1854.

first days of August, was now in full swing. Drouyn understood that the moment was unfavorable for putting pressure on Austria. The new draft treaty, which pitched the allied demands high, was intended for future use. Drouyn told Cowley "that he was of opinion that Austria should not be urged to sign it, but that France and England should wait until she herself proposed to do so. . . . If, in consequence of supporting our demands at St. Petersburg, she excited the ire of the Czar, and hostilities were threatened or attempts made to alienate her Slavonic population by Russian agents, she would be the first to ask for a treaty, and the two powers might then impose their own conditions."[53] The agreed draft was therefore laid aside in anticipation of the contingency that Austria, menaced by Russia, would be a humble petitioner for Western support.

The contingency envisaged by Drouyn was almost realized. The Russians regarded the four points as little better than a piece of impertinence. On August 16 Esterházy waited upon Nesselrode, the Russian chancellor, and communicated Buol's dispatches of August 10. "Est-ce ainsi", said Nesselrode, "que vous répondez aux sacrifices que nous nous portons en évacuant les Principautés? Comment, nous cédant aux instances de l'Autriche et dans ce même moment vous exigez de nouvelles concessions? Est-ce juste?"[54] The Russian resolve to reject the four points was so decided that Esterházy disconsolately reported that "il ne m'a pas même été possible d'observer une hésitation ou une fluctuation dans la décision prise par le cabinet russe".[55] Nesselrode indeed had the utmost difficulty in dissuading Nicholas from declaring war upon Austria. The irate czar drew up a "projet de déclaration de guerre à l'Autriche", and Nesselrode replied with a memorandum.[56] He argued that if war were now declared against

[53] Cowley to Clarendon, Aug. 17, 1854, No. 1022, F. O. 27/1021.

[54] Esterházy to Buol, Aug. 21, 1854, No. 70 A-E, Vienna, Russland X, fasc. 35. "Instances" is underlined in red, with a question mark against it. This was presumably done at the Austrian foreign office or by Franz Josef.

[55] Same to same, Aug. 30, 1854, No. 71 A-E, *ibid.* But Nesselrode told Werther, the Prussian minister, that Russia objected less to the contents of the four points than to the way in which they had been presented by Austria—just when Russia was evacuating the principalities. Werther to the king, Aug. 26, 1854, Politischer Bericht No. 13, Preussisches Geheimes Staatsarchiv, Ausw. Amt, IABq, Türkei 44, Vol. 19.

[56] Mémoire, Sept. 7, 1854, *Lettres et papiers du chancelier Comte Charles de Nesselrode, 1760-1856,* publiés et annotés par le Comte A. de Nesselrode (Paris, 1904), XI, 75-76. Baron Jomini, in his anonymous *Diplomatic Study on the Crimean War from Russian Official Sources* (London, 1882) misquotes the last sentence of Nesselrode's memorandum. Nesselrode wrote that the four points had been rejected "sans examen"; but in the *Diplomatic Study* (II, 141-2) these somewhat intransigent words are tactfully omitted.

Austria, "au lieu de trois ennemis, nous aurions à lutter contre l'Europe entière". Nesselrode prevailed, but the incident shows how near to the mark Drouyn's hypothesis had been. It needed the victory of the Alma and the pressure of Prussia before Russia, two months later, accepted the four points. Meanwhile, on September 1, Westmorland sent a decisive telegram to Clarendon: the four points had been formally rejected by Russia. The Crimean expedition was on the point of sailing, and nervous tension in the British cabinet was high. It was decided to make a second effort to bind Austria by a tripartite treaty.[57]

On September 5 the draft treaty which had been drawn up a fortnight earlier was dispatched to Westmorland, with instructions to press it on Buol. It has already been seen that this draft was drawn up for a definite contingency, a humble Austria supplicating for support. The contingency had not arisen, but the treaty was nevertheless pressed upon Austria. Apart from the initial absurdity of this proceeding, there was no lack of evidence as to the attitude Austria was likely to adopt. When Westmorland hinted at a treaty, Buol replied that he must await news from St. Petersburg.[58] Nesselrode expressed himself as delighted with his reports from Vienna,[59] and the disappointment of the allied statesmen was correspondingly great. Clarendon wrote in high anger that the Austrians "intended to throw us over in the most complete and almost impudent manner".[60] But the doomed tripartite project was allowed to go forward. On September 13 Westmorland and Bourqueney waited upon Buol, who gave the expected refusal. By the proposed treaty, he said, war "was so clearly indicated as to attribute to the government of Austria a position towards Russia more advanced than that which they had assumed".[61] Meanwhile, Drouyn was using threatening words to Hübner. He declared that the four points could now scarcely be considered binding, since "the Notes were exchanged under the supposition that a further convention would be signed binding Austria to aid in bringing about such a peace as she herself had deemed essential to the future welfare of Europe".[62] The effect of these September negotiations was therefore not to strengthen but to weaken the bonds between Austria and the Western powers, for

[57] Clarendon to the queen, Sept. 4, 1854, Royal Archives, G. 16.

[58] Westmorland to Clarendon, Sept. 6, 1854, No. 338, F. O. 7/436.

[59] Esterházy to Buol, Sept. 15, 1854, No. 74 A-B, Vienna, Russland X, fasc. 35.

[60] Clarendon to Aberdeen, Sept. 10, 1854, *Aberdeen Correspondence*, Vol. 1854-55, p. 211. On the same day Hübner found Drouyn in a similar frame of mind (*Neuf ans*, I, 266).

[61] Westmorland to Clarendon, Sept. 13, 1854, No. 348, F. O. 7/436.

[62] Cowley to Clarendon, Sept. 13, 1854, No. 1113, F. O. 27/1022.

the notes of August 8 now rested on a very insecure foundation. A decided coolness arose between Austria and the allies. Buol defended himself warmly against the allied insinuations and said that a "serious estrangement" might develop unless all knowledge of the diplomatic situation were kept from the public.[63] This coolness, however, lasted only a few days. The quick march of events in the Crimea and the still quicker march of rumor soon brought the scheme for a tripartite treaty to the front again.

Though Buol had maintained a bold front towards the Western powers, he was full of misgivings. Russia, he knew, was alienated as long as Austria refused to compromise with her in the Balkans. In imagination he saw Prussia outstripping Austria in the struggle for domination in the German *Bund;* he saw Austria, without allies, menaced by French intrigue in Italy, by Russian intrigue in the Slavonic provinces, and by revolutionary movements in half-pacified Hungary. Rightly or wrongly he was convinced that Austria's safety lay only in closer alliance with the Western powers, and he at once strove to convert the young emperor to his point of view. On September 26 he wrote a memorandum for Franz Josef on these lines. *"That peace which is necessary for us",* he declared, "we can gain only in alliance with the Maritime Powers. Russia will never give it to us."[64] Buol's efforts were aided by events in the Crimea. The allied armies landed without encountering resistance, and on September 20 was fought the spectacular and seemingly decisive battle of the Alma, news of which was accompanied by a false report of the fall of Sebastopol, which was almost universally believed. Franz Josef followed the course of the struggle with boyish enthusiasm; Buol wired congratulations to London and Paris; and certainly the Western powers were daily becoming more desirable allies.

Buol struck while the iron was hot. On October 1 Westmorland telegraphed that "Buol decided three days since to transmit to London and Paris a communication having for object to re-establish the good understanding between Austria and the Western Powers which recent circumstances appear to have disturbed."[65] On October 2 a draft treaty was forwarded to France and Britain. This draft had been drawn up

[63] Westmorland to Clarendon, Sept. 20, 1854, No. 354, F. O. 7/436.

[64] Ian Morrow, *The Black Sea Question* (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Cambridge University Library), pp. 37-8.

[65] F. O. 7/436. Buol evidently spoke of "three days" because he wished it to appear that his idea arose *before* the good news from the Crimea. This was true of Buol, but not necessarily true of Franz Josef.

by Bourqueney and Westmorland, who vouched that it was likely to be accepted by Buol at once, if proposed to him by the Western powers.[66] Though drawn up by the allied ambassadors, it was fundamentally an Austrian scheme,[67] and was regularly referred to as such. The oversubtle Buol had hidden his identity, lest the rejection of the scheme should increase the diplomatic coolness which it was now his object to end. But the Bourqueney-Westmorland draft treaty bore evident marks of its origin: nowhere was there the slightest hint that Austria would make any forward move. On October 3 Buol wrote a long letter to Colloredo, which was communicated to Clarendon on October 7. Buol declared that "l'Autriche n'a pas pris l'engagement formel d'une co-opération active, encore moins a-t-elle contracté l'obligation de prêter cette co-opération à une époque précise".[68] This was the attitude above all which the allied statesmen wished to modify, and there was nothing in the Bourqueney-Westmorland draft to bring the active co-operation of Austria nearer.

When Clarendon first heard that the Austrians were prepared to sign a treaty, he sarcastically remarked, even before he had seen the draft, that "Ld C. ventures to think that we might borrow a favourite phrase of Austria, and reserve to ourselves 'an entire freedom of action' ".[69] This was written in full belief that Sebastopol had fallen. When the bubble burst a few days later, Clarendon wrote bitterly that "Hübner begged he might be invited to the *Te Deum* and Buol announced an offensive and defensive treaty. If the news proves all false, I shall be curious to see what course will be taken by Austria."[70] Clarendon was so hostile to Austria that Aberdeen was much disturbed. He persuaded the court to use its influence with him, lest he should "discourage the proposal of a tripartite treaty".[71] Clarendon remained

[66] Westmorland to Clarendon, Oct. 2, 1854, No. 366, F. O. 7/436. Buol was at this date not only concerting schemes with the Western powers but using far more hostile language to Gortschakov. Stockhausen to Lenthe, Oct. 6, 1854, No. 130, Hannover Staatsarchiv, Hannover 9, Türkei 27 E.

[67] In the Royal Archives the document was labeled (in Prince Albert's hand) "Project of a Treaty between Austria, England, and France, as drawn up by Lord Westmorland and M. de Bourqueney, embodying Ct Buol's views" (G. 17).

[68] State Papers Domestic, Austria, F. O. 7/442. This letter is inaccurately printed by Eugène Guichen, *La Guerre de Crimée, 1854-1856, et l'attitude des puissances européennes* (Paris, 1936), p. 193. This study does not give a coherent account of the events leading up to the treaty of December 2.

[69] Clarendon to the queen, Oct. 3, 1854, Royal Archives, G. 17.

[70] Clarendon to Aberdeen, Oct. 5, 1854, Frances Balfour, *The Life of George, Fourth Earl of Aberdeen* (London, 1922), II, 257.

[71] The queen to Aberdeen, Oct. 7, 1854, *Aberdeen Correspondence*, Vol. 1854-55,

obdurate, and the arrival of the Bourqueney-Westmorland draft did nothing to reconcile him. He wrote to the queen that "the treaty binds Austria to nothing, and although in that respect useless, yet it might be adopted if the condition 'sine quâ non' made at the same time by Ct Buol was not the resumption of the Conferences at Vienna in order to discuss the *four points*".[72] He was in fact slowly concentrating his obstinacy on the question of conferences and half-heartedly reconciling himself, under pressure, to the idea of some sort of treaty with Austria. Meanwhile events had been taking a somewhat similar course in France. Drouyn told Cowley that both he and the emperor "thought the propositions detestable, and that they could not be seriously entertained". But Thouvenel reasoned that "if we refuse Austria everything, she will escape us,—and though the proposed treaty is of no immediate benefit to the Allies, it binds Austria more closely to them, and at all events commits her towards Russia". Thouvenel's words bore fruit, and Drouyn and Cowley agreed that it would be best to propose a counter project.[73] On October 10 the queen wrote Clarendon a letter pointing out that "the success in the Crimea (Alma) ought to be followed up by strengthening the alliance of the European Powers, else it may turn out a sterile victory".[74] This seems to have converted Clarendon reluctantly to the idea of a tripartite treaty, and he was in a less unsuitable frame of mind to receive the French counter project when it arrived on October 12.[75]

The French counter project, which adhered to the plan of reassembling the Conference at Vienna, was considered by the British cabinet on October 17. "Nothing was finally settled except not to reject the proposal altogether", and Clarendon was instructed to discuss with Walewski, the French ambassador, "to what extent the proposed treaty

p. 241; the queen to Clarendon (Prince Albert draft), Oct. 7, 1854, Royal Archives, G. 17. For the part played by the court during this period, see my article, "The Influence of the Crown, 1854-1856", *Juridical Review* (Edinburgh), Dec., 1936.

[72] Clarendon to the queen, Oct. 8, 1854, Royal Archives, G. 17. Colloredo commented that "le mot conférence effarouche un peu ici" (Lettre particulière, Colloredo to Buol, Oct. 10, 1854, Vienna, England VIII, fasc. 41).

[73] Extract, Cowley to Clarendon, Oct. 6, 1854, Royal Archives, G. 17; same to same, Oct. 8, 1854, No. 1223, F. O. 27/1023.

[74] Prince Albert draft, the queen to Clarendon, Oct. 10, 1854, Royal Archives, G. 17. The letter advised "a temperate consideration of the Austrian proposals, and an amendment of them in those points which seem to require them".

[75] He ruefully declared "that it is impossible not to foresee that there must be great difficulty in agreeing to a treaty, the contracting parties not meaning in reality the same thing" (Clarendon to the queen, Oct. 11, 1854, Royal Archives, G. 18).

may be further modified".[76] The interview with Walewski seems to have been abortive, and on October 20 the cabinet decided that Clarendon "should express a strong desire to enter into a treaty with Austria, having for its object some more definite understanding with a view to future co-operation" but at the same time indicate the British objection to further negotiation on the four points.[77] The result of these cabinet meetings could hardly have been less satisfactory. The British ministers, while adopting a most conciliatory tone, proclaimed themselves incapable of thinking of a suitable project and as usual left the initiative to others. The Bourqueney-Westmorland draft was rejected in a friendly way, and no alternative was suggested in its stead. But Aberdeen, though he lacked strength of will, did not lack the insight to perceive Britain's illogical position. The reasons given against a renewal of conferences, he said, were by no means reasons against a treaty, and the sooner allied relations with Austria were properly defined, the better.[78] In any case, the British refusal of the tripartite project was tendered with an unconcealed air of regret. At the same time in Austria Buol was pursuing his policy of putting relentless pressure on Russia. On October 22 the army was ordered to be set on a war footing. Characteristically this step had been delayed until the campaigning season was past. The object of the mobilization was indeed diplomatic, not military: pressure had to be exerted on Russia to force her to accept the four points. Moreover, hints were coming from St. Petersburg that Russia was likely to respond to such pressure. On October 16 Esterházy was noting the effect of the battle of the Alma. "On m'assure même", he wrote, "que l'Empereur est tout disposé aujourd'hui, surtout si les alliés ne parviennent pas à s'emparer de Sebastopol, à entrer en négociation sur les garanties recommandées par la Cour de Vienne."[79] Buol had therefore an increasing hope of ending the war without Austria's active intervention. His language to the St. Petersburg cabinet was firm, but he continued to hold out hopes that Austrian good offices would prevent the Western powers from being exorbitant in their demands.[80] He therefore took in good part the rejection of the Bourqueney-Westmorland draft. He knew that things were drifting

[76] Aberdeen to the queen, Oct. 17, 1854, *Aberdeen Correspondence*, Vol. 1854-55, p. 258.

[77] Same to same, Oct. 20, 1854, *ibid.*, pp. 258-9. Partly printed in Balfour, II, 260.

[78] Aberdeen to Clarendon, Oct. 23, 1854, *Aberdeen Correspondence*, Vol. 1854-55, p. 260.

[79] Esterházy to Buol, Oct. 16, 1854, No. 77 A-K, Vienna, Russland X, fasc. 35.

[80] Lettre particulière (copie), Buol to Esterházy, Oct. 27, 1854, *ibid.*, fasc. 36.

in the direction of a treaty, and he could afford to wait. There was thus a growing opinion in Britain, France, and Austria that some treaty should be signed, and the main difficulty was simply to find a suitable form of words. So it is not surprising that, a fortnight after the rejection of the French counter project, still another French project was produced, and on this occasion hailed with something like enthusiasm by most of the British ministers.

The new tripartite project was communicated by Walewski to Clarendon on November 1. This draft cleverly concealed the points which the British had been unable to stomach in the previous French scheme, without eliminating them. The four points were reaffirmed, but in vaguer terms.[81] Moreover, if peace had not been made on the basis of the four points by the following April, "les hautes parties contractantes conviennent de se concerter de nouveau sur les moyens les plus efficaces d'atteindre le but de leur alliance". When this draft was drawn up and when the British agreed to it, Russian acceptance of the four points seemed as far away as ever. Hence the most reasonable interpretation of the clause was that the allies should concert war plans, though this was merely hinted.[82] But after the Russian acceptance of the four points, the Austrian interpretation became the more reasonable: the powers should concert to secure a peace on those terms. Such at least was the subsequent interpretation of the treaty, whatever may have been the designs of the French when they drafted it in terms that were consciously vague, if not consciously ambiguous.

Clarendon was much pleased with the new draft and wrote, "we ought to be only too happy if Austria will agree to it".[83] Russell considered it "a greatly improved version of the Treaty" and gave his full consent to its being proposed at Vienna.[84] Aberdeen naturally concurred, for he had been opposed to the rejection of the previous French

[81] This impressed Russell, who wrote: "The great improvement in the new draft consists in the less importance given to the 4 articles, so that although they are preserved, larger terms might be put forward without any imputation from Prussia or others of bad faith" (Russell to Clarendon, Nov. 4, 1854, Clarendon Papers). I am indebted to Professor Temperley for permission to make use of extracts from Clarendon's private papers.

[82] The previous French project had been more precise. Russell indeed wrote that the new draft will "be more acceptable to Austria, as it does not bind her to make war in April in certain contingencies, which is a stipulation that would hardly work" (Russell to Clarendon, Nov. 2, 1854, *ibid.*).

[83] Clarendon to Aberdeen, Nov. 2, 1854, *Aberdeen Correspondence*, Vol. 1854-55, p. 265.

[84] Russell to Clarendon, Nov. 2, 1854, Clarendon Papers.

scheme.[85] This new British eagerness was caused not so much by the alterations in the draft as by the turn of events in the Crimea. The early enthusiasm of the beginning of October was past: men no longer lived in daily expectation of the fall of Sebastopol. The great bombardment which was to obliterate Sebastopol's defenses took place on October 17. It was a complete failure, and on the twenty-third the British commander was writing: "In the Crimea, we hold only the position on which we stand."[86] When the British statesmen considered the new French draft, their minds were full of the failure of the bombardment. The only prospect now was a long and desperate siege, which bore an ominous resemblance to the plight of the Athenians before Syracuse. Garbled reports of the Pyrrhic victory of Balaclava (October 24) were arriving. The British ministers indeed felt that a treaty with Austria might be the only means of saving the army in the Crimea. They therefore agreed that the French draft should be sent to Vienna, though they did not yet commit themselves finally to its precise wording. The draft provisionally agreed to was thus sent (November 6 and 7) to the French and British ambassadors in Vienna, and for some ten days there was a lull in the diplomatic activities of London and Paris. But during these ten days great events were casting their shadows before. First, it became evident that Russia was at last going to accept the four points. Secondly, the prolonged negotiations in the German *Bund* were obviously on the point of reaching some conclusion. Thirdly, the hard-won battle of Inkerman and the growing reports of disorganization and suffering in the Crimea were still further sapping the confidence of the allied statesmen. The diplomatic situation had radically altered by the time that the Austrian counter project was being debated in the cabinets of the maritime powers.

Ever since August 8 Frederick William IV of Prussia and Chancellor Nesselrode had been pressing Czar Nicholas to adopt the four points. Their efforts were not relaxed even after Nicholas decisively rejected them. Allied successes in the Crimea and the Austrian mobilization of October 22 added weight to their arguments; at the beginning of November Nicholas reluctantly decided upon acceptance. On the eighth Esterházy wired to Buol that acceptance was imminent, and on the seventeenth he was able to announce that it had actually taken

[85] Aberdeen to Clarendon, Nov. 2, 1854, *Aberdeen Correspondence*, Vol. 1854-55, p. 266.

[86] Raglan to Newcastle, Oct. 23, 1854, John Martineau, *The Life of Henry Pelham, Fifth Duke of Newcastle, 1811-1864* (London, 1908), p. 174.

place.[87] Westmorland telegraphed the news to Clarendon on the twentieth, adding that Buol "stated distinctly that he did not consider that this communication ought in any manner to interrupt the negotiations between our Governments".[88] But, whatever may have been Buol's private opinion, the Russian adhesion was considered of sufficient importance by the Austrian cabinet for the mobilization order of October 20 to be revoked, in so far as it had not already taken effect.[89] Esterházy's telegram announcing the decisive Russian acceptance had been received on November 20; the revocation order was decided upon on the twenty-first, which was surely more than a coincidence.[90] Now that the four points were agreed upon by all the belligerents, the mobilization had served its purpose. By canceling her warlike preparations, Austria gave a lead to the other powers: the winter should be given over to negotiation, and peace might be achieved before the spring.

During this same month of November the confused diplomacy of the *Bund* powers was at last reaching some sort of climax. The problem was whether Austria was going to be drawn into the Anglo-French camp and thus accomplish a diplomatic revolution, or whether she was going to be persuaded into a central neutrality by the German states and perhaps (when the war was over) be drawn back into a renewed Holy Alliance. Austria dared not go too far without some guarantee of a benevolently neutral Prussia, and, since the treaty of April 20, Prussia had refused to give her further assurances. Austria's object was to obtain at least the protection by Prussia and the *Bund* of the Austrian occupation of the principalities. On November 9 the Vienna cabinet assured Prussia that no compact would be made with the Western powers without her knowledge: Prussia would not again, as on August 8, be presented with a *fait accompli*.[91] On November 26

[87] Cipher telegram, Esterházy to Buol, Nov. 8, 1854. This dispatch reached Vienna at 6 p. m. on the same day. Cipher telegram, same to same, Nov. 17, 1854. This dispatch did not reach Vienna until the twentieth (Vienna, Russland X, fasc. 35). Esterházy was informed of the Russian acceptance on November 16.

[88] Cipher telegram, F. O. 7/438, received 8 a. m., Nov. 21, 1854.

[89] Friedjung, pp. 115-117.

[90] Friedjung's interpretation is that Franz Josef, confronted with the prospect of war with Russia, recoiled and discontinued the mobilization. This hardly holds water, for by November 21 the prospect was negotiation, not war.

[91] Friedjung, p. 120. This promise was rudely broken a few weeks later. The Prussian government was indeed informed by Buol of the intention of Austria to sign a treaty, "but it is at the same time stated that no objection on their part will arrest or change the decision taken in Vienna" (cipher telegram, Westmorland to Clarendon, Nov. 29, 1854, F. O. 7/438).

the negotiation was successfully concluded. Prussia guaranteed the Austrian troops in the principalities against attack and agreed to support the Austrian propositions in the Frankfurt Diet.[92] Prussia hoped that she might inveigle Austria into a compromising position towards the Western powers, and it will be seen that the Prussian calculation was nearly correct. In any event, these strong crosscurrents vitally affected the negotiations for a tripartite treaty that were now proceeding.

It has been seen that the draft provisionally agreed upon between Paris and London had been sent to Vienna from those capitals on November 6 and 7, respectively. On November 13 the allied ambassadors waited upon Buol, whose various amendments led him to draw up a new draft.[93] There were two important alterations. Article V now declared that if peace on the basis of the four points had not been assured "dans le cours de la presente année" (instead of "au mois d'avril prochain"), the signatories "délibereront sans retard sur les moyens les plus efficaces pour obtenir l'objet de leur alliance". The article meant, to Buol, the opening of conferences on the four points—hence, the sooner they started the better. Buol also added a secret article stating that if peace were not restored by January, military conversations should at once be opened between the signatories. By these two modifications Buol considered himself to have given Austria an excellent position for either eventuality, peace or war. The French put strong pressure upon the British ministers to accept the revised draft treaty immediately. They hesitated;[94] but they were in no position to reject it, whatever their opinion of it. News from the Crimea was more and more disheartening. At Inkerman (November 5) the allies had been within an ace of being thrust into the sea. It was in an atmosphere of misery and gloom that the British cabinet met to consider Buol's draft,[95] and it is not surprising, therefore, that it was ac-

[92] Hübner, I, 281.

[93] Westmorland to Clarendon, Nov. 15, 1854, No. 432, F. O. 7/437.

[94] Strangely enough, Palmerston was in favor of the treaty. On November 19 he was in Paris and had to some degree taken on the color of his surroundings (copy, Palmerston to Clarendon, Nov. 19, 1854, Royal Archives, G. 19). But on the same day Aberdeen wrote to Clarendon that "this extraordinary haste has rather the appearance on our part of a trick, and bad faith in dealing with the engagement" (Clarendon Papers). On the twentieth Clarendon wrote to the queen that he thought that "Austria is not sincere in this matter, and that the treaty will neither afford assistance nor be a cause of satisfaction to us" (Royal Archives, G. 19).

[95] Lady Clarendon noted on November 18: "The reports in London are horrid. It is useless to record what is dreadful and may turn out not true, as it is not known officially, so I will not record these rumours" (Sir Herbert Maxwell, *The Life and Letters of the Fourth Earl of Clarendon*, London, 1913, II, 50-51).

cepted. In a dispatch dated November 22 Clarendon authorized Westmorland to sign the tripartite treaty.[96]

The Austrian counter project had been put forward in proper order by Buol and had been duly accepted in Paris and London. There was still, however, a final struggle before Franz Josef was convinced that Austria's interests demanded a Western alliance. Russia's adhesion to the four points and Prussia's readiness to extend the treaty of April 20 made the policy of a strong central neutrality very attractive. The struggle of influences in the Austrian cabinet seems to have reached a climax in meetings held on November 17 and 19. Kübeck declared that "at the meeting of November 17 only General Hess and myself pointed out the necessity for peace; Count Buol and Bach hurled spears and arrows against Russia. The emperor did not then express his opinion."[97] Evidence of these important meetings is very scanty.[98] Apparently even on November 19 Franz Josef did not deliver his final judgment. Ultimately the forces in favor of the signature of a treaty proved the stronger. Buol felt himself so deeply committed that if the treaty were now refused, he would be forced to resign. Bourqueney and Westmorland used the strongest language.[99] On November 29 Westmorland was able to telegraph that the treaty was accepted, and on December 2 it was signed in due form by the plenipotentiaries of Austria, France, and Britain.

III

Significance of the Treaty

The critical articles of the treaty were Articles I and V.[100] Article I declared that the signatories confirmed the four points and reserved the right to propose further terms. No arrangement was to be entered into with Russia without previous consultation. Article V declared that if, by the end of the year, peace were not assured on the basis of Article I, the signatories would deliberate as to the best means of securing the object of their alliance. It must again be emphasized that when this clause was drafted by the French, the only possible "moyens les plus efficaces pour obtenir l'objet de leur alliance" were *warlike measures,*

[96] No. 373, F. O. 7/430.

[97] Dec. 16, 1854, *Das Tagebuch des Polizeiministers Kempen von 1848 bis 1859,* ed. by Josef Karl Mayr (Vienna, 1931).

[98] No "Ministerprotokoll" exists for either of the meetings. Friedjung (pp. 114-15) learned of them from the papers of Bach. See Kempen's *Tagebuch,* p. 348, n.

[99] There is no evidence that they threatened to demand their passports. See *English Historical Review,* Apr., 1935, pp. 377-8.

[100] The British copy of the treaty is in F. O. 93/5, Austria 29.

doubtless to be preceded by an Austrian ultimatum. By the date of the signature, however, Russia had unconditionally accepted the four points. The object of the alliance was, according to the preamble, "de mettre fin le plus tôt possible à la guerre actuelle par le rétablissement de la paix générale", and this object could now obviously be best attained by negotiation, if all the powers were sincere in their adhesion to the four points. In spite of this article the British nursed the hope that negotiation might be avoided, and they resisted it to the last. Having been drawn, step by step, first into the exchange of notes of August 8, then into the treaty of December 2, many British statesmen refused to concede the full implications of the diplomatic instruments to which they had given their consent. Fundamentally, they had been trying to deceive Austria by agreeing to projects which they thought would never become operative because of the obstinacy of the Russians. When the Russians proved unexpectedly conciliatory, and the measures concerted with Austria became operative in the sense of negotiation, several of the ministers obscurely felt that they had been deceived, which really meant that they had failed to deceive. On the whole, in Britain the treaty was regarded with impatience; while Sebastopol remained untaken, all else could wait.

In France, on the contrary, news of the signature of the tripartite treaty was received with acclamation. On December 2 there had been gloom at the Tuileries over dinner, and Napoleon III was especially dispirited. "Mais lorsqu'en se levant de table il reçut la nouvelle si impatiemment attendue de Vienne, il perdit toute contenance, courut à l'Impératrice, l'embrassa, et la tint longtemps serrée sur son coeur." [101] Westmorland wrote that "my friend Bourqueney has been lauded to the skies for his part in the work, and he has been decorated with the highest mark of favor that could be bestowed upon him, the grand Cordon of the Legion d'Honneur".[102] This ebullition of joy, so different from the British reaction to the treaty, had its origin in the desire, deep-rooted in every Frenchman, to overturn the 1815 settlement. France was now achieving her object, namely "to put an end to the Northern Coalition, the main object of which, since 1815, has been to hold France in check".[103] "Politiquement, militairement, le traité du 2 décembre

[101] Hübner, I, 284. The French were delighted in spite of the fact that they had to promise more than the British to secure the treaty. A separate Franco-Austrian convention was signed, guaranteeing the Austrian position in Italy during the war. It is clear that the Austrians would not have signed the tripartite treaty without this corollary.

[102] Copy, Westmorland to Clarendon, Dec. 13, 1854, Royal Archives, G. 21.

[103] Cowley to Clarendon, Dec. 4, 1854, No. 1459, F. O. 27/1027.

renverse tout et revèle un nouvel horizon", wrote Benedetti. "Vous aviez blessé à mort la Sainte-Alliance; vous venez de la mettre en terre, avec enterrement de première classe."[104] Napoleon might well embrace his beautiful empress, Bourqueney revel in his Grand Cordon, and Benedetti indite his paean of victory: the glories of the Second Empire were as yet undimmed, and an epoch was opening in which France might again be Napoleonic. France had at last accomplished the desired diplomatic revolution, had at last broken the bonds of that system of alliances that had fettered her since Waterloo. Benedetti lived to interview William of Prussia at Ems; Napoleon lived to give up his sword at Sedan; Bourqueney, more fortunate than either, died before the fatal year 1870 dawned.

In Austria public opinion was strongly in favor of the treaty of December 2. Bach, who was a strong supporter of the Western alliance, influenced the press in that direction. "The Austrian policy of those days appears to me almost incredible", wrote Beust. "If anything could make one judge it leniently, it would be the fact that the Vienna newspapers were full of enthusiasm in its praise."[105] The policy of December 2 was distinctively the policy of Buol and Bach. The powerful Russophil party was disgusted; the "pan-German" party resented the abandonment of Prussia; even the supporters of the Western alliance frequently thought that the treaty did not go far enough. To Hübner and Prokesch-Osten the Western alliance meant war, to Buol it meant negotiation, and negotiation which had every hope of success if the powers were honest about the four points. He did not want to enter a war that might develop into a "war of nationalities", nor did he wish Russia to be so weakened that a severe shock would be given to the balance of power. He sincerely wanted a reasonable peace, a peace that would secure Austria's special interests in the Balkans. But he was a good pupil of Schwarzenberg, who swore that men would marvel at Austria's ingratitude. Austria's special interests were to be guarded by Austria's armed might, not by a compromise with Russia. This was a question of prestige, not a question of interest, for compromise with Russia was always possible, so long as Panslavism was kept under control. As Beust put it, Nicholas "was a decided enemy of all Panslavistic aspirations, which can unfortunately not be said of his successor".[106]

[104] Benedetti to Thouvenel, Dec. 10, 1854, Louis Thouvenel, *Pages de l'histoire du Second Empire, 1854-1866* (Paris, 1903), pp. 26-7.

[105] Beust, I, 132.

[106] *Ibid.*, p. 137.

It was Austria's own policy of 1854 that roused the Panslav demon, rendered irreconcilable the Austro-Russian rivalry in the Balkans, and ultimately involved both Habsburg and Romanov in ruin.

Buol's policy had a fatal defect. As the aged Metternich put it at this time: "The consequences of any and every action are hidden from Count Buol. He sees what is right in front of him; of what is coming, he sees nothing."[107] Buol's policy was indeed excellent on the surface, but it was a whited sepulcher. Austria had occupied the principalities and was openly braving the Russian monster. The Habsburg monarchy was praised almost unanimously in the German press, an experience unique in its annals. Prussia was secured by the engagements of April 20 and November 26, and Austria was allied to the maritime powers. The war seemed within measurable distance of being ended, but, should Austro-Russian hostilities ensue, powerful support was promised. Finally, Austria was feeling more powerful within herself, and revolution seemed no longer a danger. But though internal revolution seemed far away, another sort of revolution was being carried out by Buol himself—a diplomatic revolution. Buol told Westmorland that "the revolution (for it is nothing less) which has been accomplished in the alliances of Austria has met with many and powerful opponents among certain ranks of the army, and some portions of the civil administration. . . . The Emperor, who had much to overcome in his own mind, feels indulgent to those who did not accept the conversion to this new policy as quickly as he did himself."[108]

Franz Josef's conversion to this new policy became one of his lifelong regrets. A British diplomat noted in 1878: "In youth, the Emperor had a great devotion for the Emperor Nicholas, who certainly saved Hungary for the Austrian monarchy. He often regrets his separation from Russia in 1856, and the imputation of ingratitude then freely made against him."[109] Czar Nicholas had indeed regarded Franz Josef with almost paternal affection, and the treaty of December 2 cut him to the quick. He gave vent to his feelings by presenting his valet with a statuette of Franz Josef which had hitherto adorned his study. It is recorded that he asked Esterházy who were the two most foolish kings of Poland and answered that they were John Sobieski and

[107] Metternich to Kübeck, Dec. 9, 1854, *Metternich und Kübeck: Ein Briefwechsel* (Vienna, 1910, supplementary volume to the *Tagebücher des Karl Friedrich Freiherrn Kübeck von Kübau*, Vienna, 1909), pp. 190-1. This letter is partly translated in Joseph Redlich, *Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria* (London, 1929), p. 163.

[108] Westmorland to Clarendon, Oct. 18, 1854, No. 393, F. O. 7/437.

[109] Henry Drummond-Wolff, *Rambling Recollections* (London, 1908), II, 163.

himself, for they had both saved Austria.[110] Nicholas died within a few months, and his subjects, who both loved and feared him, felt that Austrian ingratitude had driven him to the grave. Burnaby, who made the famous ride to Khiva twenty years later, recorded: "During my journey through Russia I was struck by the marked hostility shown by all classes to the Austrians and Germans, the conduct of the former power during the Crimean War having left a very bitter feeling behind it."[111] This feeling existed not only throughout Russia but also among friends of Russia in other countries. Salisbury recorded, for example, how in 1876 Bismarck "related almost with passion the story of how Nicholas interfered in Francis Joseph's behalf to restore him gratis a revolted kingdom, with a chivalry which no other sovereign had ever exhibited before, and how Francis Joseph repaid him with the ingratitude of 1854".[112] Here was a consequence of Buol's diplomatic revolution which he did not foresee. It was foreseen by Metternich—hence the aged statesman's gloom, and hence his scathing criticism of Buol. By Buol's policy Austria lost the two allies she had kept almost without intermission since 1815, and she gained no permanent allies in return. It is just possible that a firm alliance with France, such as that envisaged by Drouyn de Lhuys, would have been feasible had another policy been pursued after December 2, 1854; it is possible that in other circumstances Drouyn de Lhuys might have persuaded Napoleon to enter the war of 1866. But at best the Habsburg Monarchy and the Second Empire were an ill-assorted pair. Buol's policy may find some support in the realm of speculation, but in the realm of fact it brought 1859 and 1866 in its train.

GAVIN B. HENDERSON.

The University, Glasgow.

[110] Friedjung, p. 127.

[111] Fred Burnaby, *A Ride to Khiva* (London, 1877), p. 332.

[112] Salisbury to Beaconsfield, Nov. 28, 1876, Lady Gwendolen Cecil, *Life of the Marquis of Salisbury* (London, 1921), II, 105.

JOHN MARSHALL AS A HISTORIAN

To contemporaries the significance of the publication of *The Life of George Washington* by John Marshall, aside from its value as history, lay in the fact that the biography of the great national hero by the Federalist chief justice made its appearance in the year when Jefferson was seeking re-election.[1] To later generations of Americans, especially to students of history, its high reputation was based on a belief that Marshall's "political acumen and his judicial equipoise were such as to give his work a great and permanent importance".[2]

This tradition may be traced, perhaps, to the reputation of John Marshall as a judge. It was natural to believe that a history written by the great jurist would be marked by soundness, high scholarly qualities, and reliability. As time went on, critics became more and more convinced of the historical value of his book. "The habits of his mind", wrote Judge Story in 1828, when reviewing the separate edition of the first volume (published in 1824), "were close investigation, caution, patience, and a steady devotion to the weight of evidence. He examines all the material before him with the sobriety and impartiality of judicial life".[3] In the same vein this reviewer delivered a succinct summary of contemporary opinion of Marshall's work when he wrote, "it could scarcely be doubted that his 'Life of Washington' would be invaluable for the truth of its facts and the accuracy and completeness of its narrative, and such has been and will continue to be its reputation".[4]

This judgment of the value of Marshall's *Washington* has stood the scrutiny of succeeding scholars down to the present; indeed, it has been repeatedly reaffirmed. Both Washington Irving and Jared Sparks attested to its accuracy, and the latter added that "after the able, accurate, and comprehensive work of Chief Justice Marshall, it would be presumptuous to attempt a historical biography of Washington".[5] In a

[1] The circumstances surrounding the writing of the work are described at length in Albert J. Beveridge, *The Life of John Marshall* (Boston, 1916-19), III, 223-73.

[2] Charles Kendall Adams, *A Manual of Historical Literature* (New York, 1882), p. 582.

[3] *North American Review*, XXVI, 38.

[4] *The National Portrait Gallery of Distinguished Americans* (Philadelphia, 1834), I, 17 of the section on Marshall.

[5] Allan B. Magruder, *John Marshall* (Boston, 1885), p. 238; *The Writings of George Washington*, Jared Sparks, ed. (New York, 1847), I, xii.

later generation Justin Winsor found nothing to question in such a judgment, for he said that through the work of Marshall "the most authentic material respecting Washington's life, namely, his own papers, received the impress of a true historic spirit".[6] The stamp of authority which Story and later critics impressed upon the *Life of Washington* allows it still to pass current for solid coin. Professor Bassett described it as an "able book", one of "the most valuable for the period of his [Washington's] presidency".[7] With greater emphasis Charles A. Beard wrote that Marshall "had studied long and arduously the history of the period for his classic defense of Federalism, 'The Life of Washington,' " and that "as a historian of great acumen, in which capacity he was not hampered by the bench and bar, Marshall sketched with unerring hand the economic conflict which led to the adoption of the constitution". He characterized the book as "masterly".[8] Even so keen and careful a scholar as Herbert L. Osgood wrote of the "wide knowledge" and "well balanced judgment of the great jurist" and reported that "occasionally, though not often, a statement appears which later investigations have shown to be improbable or unfounded. In general its accuracy, and in all its parts its fairness, are unimpeachable".[9]

The validity of this tradition has not heretofore been tested by a critical examination of Marshall's use of his authorities. The present article will set forth the results of such an investigation, undertaken in order that Marshall's technique and scholarship may be properly evaluated.

Of the original octavo edition, two volumes were published in 1804, the third and fourth followed in 1805, and the last appeared in 1807. Simultaneously a quarto edition was issued in Philadelphia and London. In 1805 the first four volumes of a slightly altered version were published and were followed by a fifth in 1807. The changes between this edition and the previous one are negligible. The footnotes of Volume I alone were altered, and dates were generally removed from text to margin.[10] In 1824 Marshall detached the first volume of his work and published it separately as a *History of the American Colonies*. A revised

[6] *Narrative and Critical History of America* (Boston, 1884-1889), VII, 300.

[7] John Spencer Bassett, *The Federalist System* (New York, 1906), p. 301.

[8] *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States*. (New York, 1913), pp. 181, 296.

[9] In a review of Marshall's first volume in *The Literature of American History*, H. N. Larned, ed. (Boston, 1902), p. 74.

[10] Apparently this first revision has escaped bibliographical notice; at any rate Winsor, Larned, and the *Guide* of Channing, Hart, and Turner make no mention of it.

version of the *Life* appeared in 1832 at Philadelphia. Volume I was omitted from this edition, and the remaining four volumes were reduced to two, but as Beveridge said, "they were so closely printed and in such comparatively small type that the real condensation was far less than it appeared to be".[11] This edition enjoyed such success that a one-volume version of it for use in schools was issued in 1838, three years after the death of the chief justice.[12]

An examination of the *Life of Washington* shows at once an aspect of Marshall's technique as a historian which, at least to a scholar of today, would seem curious. This is his method of acknowledging his authorities. In Volume I of the original edition of 1804 his acknowledgments were slight indeed. At the end of each chapter he listed his authorities. In general no title, volume, or page reference was given, merely the author's name, such as Chalmers, Stith, Belknap, or, perhaps only, "History of South Carolina and Georgia". In the 1805 edition of Volume I, Marshall approached a short step nearer modern practice and recognized his authorities by a letter before or after the pertinent passages in the text and a corresponding footnote. Titles and page references were again left out. Once adopted, the chief justice followed this method in all the subsequent volumes, both in the original and in the revised edition. It might be supposed that such acknowledgments were intended to apply to a single sentence, but it is evident that Marshall meant them to apply to paragraphs. Frequently each paragraph of an entire series would be thus annotated. In fact, if acknowledged at all, most of the long passages borrowed were avowed in this way. Acknowledgments of any kind, however, were few, appearing with no greater frequency than approximately twenty for each five hundred page volume.[13] Volume I excepted, their position and number in the later editions are identical with those of the original. As will be shown, these citations were grossly inadequate, since Marshall's volumes were in fact hasty and careless compilations of unacknowledged borrowings.

Volume I, that portion of Marshall's *Washington* to which Osgood's praise applied, was almost entirely the result of borrowing. Examples of copying without acknowledgment were collected by the present writer from 268 of the 488 pages of the original edition and from every part of

[11] III, 272-3. [12] *Ibid.*, p. 273.

[13] This statement does not apply to Volume I or to the first 200 pages of Volume II of the edition of 1805. This portion of Volume II was originally sent by Marshall to the publisher, Wayne, as part of Volume I (Beveridge, III, 237). The remainder of Volume II contains about 20 references; Volume III contains the largest number, nearly 50; Volume IV has 17, while Volume V contains almost no references.

the volume. Further study would undoubtedly have resulted in the identification of additional passages. The altered method of acknowledgment which the chief justice adopted for the 1805 edition of this volume reduced this large proportion, but in it, too, examples of unavowed borrowing were easily gathered. Moreover, in abandoning the blanket recognitions of the edition of 1804 and substituting footnote references, Marshall rendered himself more vulnerable to a charge of copying by allowing his readers to assume that each instance of borrowing was acknowledged.

That such was not the case may be demonstrated by examples of Marshall's borrowing which are acknowledged only to the extent of inserting the name of the author at the end of the chapter in the 1804 edition and not at all in that of 1805. There are many such examples, but a single one must suffice:

> *Belknap.* The next morning as Vaughan was returning with thirteen men only, he crept up the hill which overlooked the battery, and observed, that the chimneys of the barracks were without smoke, and the staff without a flag. With a bottle of brandy . . . he hired . . . a Cape Cod Indian, to crawl in an embrasure and open the gate . . .
>
> *Marshall.* . . . the next morning as Vaughan was returning to camp with thirteen men only, he crept up the hill which overlooked the battery, and observing that the chimnies of the barracks were without smoke and the staff without a flag, hired a Cape Cod Indian with a bottle of rum, to crawl in at an embrasure and open the gate.[14]

Such close borrowing is characteristic of Volume I. It is unfortunate that this is so, for the chief justice consulted many works, in most cases the best authorities available, and had he allowed his mind to impress itself upon the material, something better would have resulted than that which is to be found.

Marshall frequently varied his practice and, instead of employing

[14] Jeremy Belknap, *The History of New-Hampshire, from a Copy of the Original Edition, having the Author's Last Corrections to which are added Notes,* John Farmer, ed. (Dover, 1862), p. 277; Marshall, I, 353-4, I (1805), 334-5. Other examples are: Belknap, pp. 277-8; Marshall, I, 354, I (1805), 334-5. Belknap, p. 280; Marshall, I, 357, I (1805), 337. Thomas Hutchinson, *The History of Massachusetts* (Boston, 1795), II, 188; Marshall, I, 278-9, I (1805), 260-5. Hutchinson, II, 189; Marshall, I, 279, I (1805), 265. William Robertson, "The History of America", *The Works of,* (London, 1824), III, 217; Marshall, I, 28-9, I (1805), 27-8. George Chalmers, *Political Annals of the present United Colonies, from their Settlement to the Peace of 1763* (London, 1780), pp. 175-6; Marshall, I, 140-1, I (1805), 135. Belknap, p. 177; Marshall, I, 256-7, I (1805), 243-4. Further examples are: Hutchinson, II, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 307, 308; Marshall, I, 290-1, 292, 293, I (1805), 275-6, 277, 278.

long verbatim passages, intermingled brief sections, often paraphrased from one or more books. This tendency to paraphrase undermined the value of his work, for though he culled information from numerous earlier writers, his exposition of a particular event, in many cases, was not Marshall but a mixture of passages from previous histories selected with no ascertainable purpose. His description of the Indian massacre of 1622 in Virginia illustrates how numbers of undigested phrases and sentences were fitted together into an account:

> Engaged in the cultivation of the soil, all their views seemed directed to that single object, and their military exercises and all useful precautions were laid aside; while the Indians being often employed as hunters, were furnished with fire arms, and taught to use them. [*Robertson.* . . . and all were so intent on what was subservient to the comfort and embellishment of civil life that every martial exercise began to be laid aside. . . . The Indians, whom they commonly employed as hunters, were furnished with fire arms, and taught to use them with dexterity.] They were admitted at all times freely into the habitation of the English as harmless visitants; were fed at their tables, and lodged in their chambers. . . . [*Robertson.* They were permitted to frequent the habitations of the English at all hours, and received as innocent visitants. . . . *Stith.* . . . fed at their tables, and even lodged in their bedchambers.] So deep and dark was their dissimulation that they were accustomed to borrow the boats from the English to cross the river, in order to concert and mature their execrable designs.
>
> The better to disguise their intentions, and to ensure success, they brought in the preceding evening, deer, turkies, and fish, as presents; and, even on the morning of the massacre, came freely among them, behaving in their usual friendly manner, until the very instant which had been appointed. . . . [*Beverly.* The Indians had been so familiar with the English, as to borrow their boats and canoes to cross the river in, when they went to consult with their neighbouring Indians upon this execrable conspiracy. And, to colour their designs the better, they brought presents of deer, Turkies, Fish, and fruits to the English the evening before. The very morning of the massacre they came freely and unarmed among them . . . behaving themselves with same . . . friendship as formerly, till the very minute they were to put their plot into execution.] Thus in one hour and almost at the same instant, fell three hundred and forty-seven men, women, and children, most of them by their own plantation tools and utensils. . . . [*Stith.* And thus, in one hour, and almost at the same instant, fell three hundred and forty-seven Men, Women and Children; most of them, by their own Tools and Weapons.] As soon as intelligence of these calamitous events reached England, a contribution of the adventurers for the relief of the sufferers was ordered; arms from the tower were delivered to the treasurer and company; and several vessels were immediately dispatched with those articles which might alleviate such complicated distress. [*Chalmers.* Tidings of these deplorable events no sooner reached England than the privy-council . . . ordered an instant contribution of the adventurers for the relief of that signal calamity. Upon application of the Treasurer and company, arms from the tower

were delivered them: and several vessels were soon dispatched with everything which could alleviate complicated distress.[15]

These methods were often used by Marshall to condense extensive portions of the books he consulted. Condensation is really too kind a word to apply to these portions of Volume I, for they are condensations only in point of space occupied. Selecting a particular author's treatment of a subject, Marshall often followed his entire framework and sequence of ideas, but by paraphrasing, pruning out entire sections, and including others verbatim, the chief justice would arrive at a skeletonized version of the original.

The early history of Virginia, which is the subject of chapter II of Volume I, is merely a combination of selected passages from Stith and Chalmers.[16] The entire ninth chapter, which covers the early history of South Carolina and Georgia, is borrowed from Hewatt's history of those colonies and is colored by words, phrases, and even large verbatim insertions from the original.[17] A similar instance is Marshall's treatment of Massachusetts history from 1713 to 1741. Here he edits, paraphrases, and prunes, but the result is still Hutchinson.[18] In a like manner, the great bulk of Marshall's narrative of the Louisburg expedition is a pale copy of Belknap's version of the same events, and more examples of this method may be cited.[19] It must have been extremely laborious to continue, as Marshall did for page after page, simply placing the authorities

[15] Robert Beverly, *The History of the Present State of Virginia . . . by a Native and Inhabitant of the Place* (London, 1705), pp. 40-1; Robertson, III, 239-240; William Stith, *The History of Virginia* (New York, 1865), p. 210; Chalmers, p. 59; Marshall, I, 66-8, I (1805), 64-6.

[16] Chalmers, pp. 13-33, Stith, pp. 30-1; Marshall, I, 23-50, I (1805), 23-6.

[17] Alexander Hewatt, *An Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the Colonies of South Carolina and Georgia* (London, 1779), I, 219-290; Marshall, I, 309, 337, I (1805), 293-314. Here one finds an example of the added vulnerability of the style of acknowledgment adopted by Marshall in the 1805 edition of Volume I, for in this ninth chapter there is no blanket avowal of the appropriation, as in the edition of 1804, but a recognition of the source of only two unimportant paragraphs amid twenty pages borrowed. I (1805), 307-8.

[18] Hutchinson, II, 188-90; Marshall, I, 279. Hutchinson, II, 197-8; Marshall, I, 280. Hutchinson, II, 222; Marshall, I, 283. Hutchinson, II, 257; Marshall, I, 285. Hutchinson, II, 317; Marshall, I, 298. Marshall is loosely following Hutchinson throughout these pages: I, 278-308, I (1805), 264-292.

[19] Belknap, pp. 265-85; Marshall, I, 345-65, I (1805), 326-38. Chalmers, pp. 512-52; Marshall, I, 186-97. Robertson, III, 286-9, Chalmers, pp. 80-1, 136, 137, 142; Marshall, I, 95-8, I (1805), 92-6. Robertson, III, 210-11, Stith pp. 30-1; Marshall, I, 20, I (1805), 19-20. Hutchinson, II, 150-1, 152-3, 160-2, Belknap, pp. 174, 177, 180; Marshall, I, 251-8, I (1805), 238-40. Isolated paragraphs within these sections are avowed in the 1805 edition.

in front of him and, without passing them through his mind, copying one and then another.

Though it would be justifiable to judge the first volume on its merits alone, since it was later published separately as *The History of the American Colonies,* our estimate of it may be qualified by Marshall's insistence that it be "denominated an introduction" and as such subordinated to his main theme.[20] He dropped it "with great propriety" from the revised edition.[21] These considerations might allow the volume to be judged sympathetically.

In the volumes which constitute the *Life* in a strict sense the biographer of Washington might have been expected to hew closer to the line of originality. At first glance one's expectations seem to be fulfilled. Marshall's apprenticeship in the history of the colonies had taken the rawness from his method. He did not so obviously borrow from others, at least entire chapters are not culled directly from them. But the investigator has not far to seek before examples of copying come readily and in numbers to his hand.

The secondary works most used by Marshall in the creation of his *Washington* were William Gordon's history of the American Revolution and the *Annual Register.*[22] From their pages the chief justice copied, without acknowledgment, passages varying in length from single sentences to entire pages. Examples of short passages might be multiplied endlessly, but a few must serve. These often appear intermittently over extended portions, thus destroying the reader's confidence in the originality of the whole.

A.R. The succeeding day was to close the tragedy. André was superior to the terrors of death; but that disgraceful mode of dying, which the usage of war had annexed to his unhappy situation, was to him, infinitely dreadful. He equally wished to die like a soldier, and that, so far as it was possible, every trace and memorial of the cause which led to his fall might be erased. He had accordingly written a pathetic letter, fraught with all the feelings of a man of sentiment and honour, to Washington, imploring a mitigation in that respect. How far a relaxation of the rigid maxims and usages of war, might, upon this occasion with propriety have been indulged, is a question that involves too many considerations, for us to enter into. But as it was not

[20] Beveridge, III, 237.

[21] *The National Portrait Gallery of Distinguished Americans,* I, 17 of the section on Marshall.

[22] William Gordon, *The History of the Rise, Progress, and Establishment of the Independence of the United States of America* (New York, 1801). The references to the *Annual Register,* hereafter cited as *A.R.,* apply, unless otherwise indicated, to that section styled "The History of Europe".

deemed fitting to grant the request, it was thought humane to evade giving a direct answer. He encountered his fate with a composure, dignity and fortitude, which equally excited the admiration, and melted the hearts of all the spectators.

Marshall. Superior to the terrors of death, but dreading disgrace, André was deeply affected by the mode of dying which the laws of war had decreed to persons in his situation. He wished to die like a soldier, not as a criminal. To obtain a mitigation of his sentence in this respect, he addressed a letter to general Washington replete with all the feelings of a man of sentiment and honour. But the occasion required that the example should make its full impression, and this request could not be granted. He encountered his fate with composure, dignity, and fortitude; and such was his whole conduct as to excite the admiration, and interest the feelings of all who witnessed it.[23]

Gordon. . . . they urged in the strongest terms, the militia in general, and the minute-men in particular, to spare neither time, pains, nor expense, at so critical a juncture, for perfecting themselves forthwith in the military discipline. They passed resolutions for the providing and making of fire-arms and bayonets . . .

Marshall. They therefore urged, in the strongest terms, the militia in general, and the minute-men in particular, to spare neither time, pains, nor expense, at so critical a juncture, to perfect themselves in military discipline. They also passed resolutions for procuring and making fire arms and bayonets.[24]

A.R. A very warm engagement ensued, and continued about two hours, during which those vessels which were most ahead, pushed on with the utmost speed, and passing Crown Point, escaped to Ticonderoga; but two gallies and five gondolas, which remained with Arnold, made a desperate resistance . . .

Marshall. He kept up a warm engagement for about two hours, in the course of which, those vessels, which were most ahead, pushed on with the utmost speed, and, passing Crown Point, escaped to Ticonderoga. Two gallies and five gondolas which remained, made a desperate resistance.[25]

Though short bursts of copying are characteristic of Marshall's *Washington,* much longer sections were often incorporated in its pages. One of the most spectacular examples of borrowing is Marshall's description of the battle of Camden. Its very length prevents its inclusion here, for approximately twelve pages are an almost verbatim copy of Gordon's exposition.[26]

[23] *A.R.,* 1781, p. 45; Marshall, IV, 284, I (revised), 380. References are not given for any volumes of the edition whose first four volumes appeared in 1805, for the citations contained in them are identical with the original, as is the text, for all practical purposes. References will occasionally be given to the revised edition for purposes of later discussion.

[24] Gordon, I, 305; Marshall, II, 196.

[25] *A.R.,* 1777, p. 5; Marshall, III, 9-10. Similar examples are: *A.R.,* 1779, p. 188; Marshall, IV, 63-4, I (revised), 378-9. *A.R.,* 1777, pp. 4-5; Marshall, III, 8-10. Gordon, I, 251-2; Marshall, II, 185-6.

[26] Gordon, III, 98-108; Marshall, IV, 172-190.

This instance was not an exceptional example, for his description of the Moore's Creek Bridge episode in the early days of the Revolution, taken practically verbatim from the *Annual Register,* is a parallel case. In this bit of copying the chief justice exemplified a favorite practice when he cited his authorities for one paragraph but borrowed three pages. Moreover, in this particular case he cited "Gordon . . . Ramsay . . . Gazette" along with the "Annual Register", although he patently copied from the *Annual Register* only.[27] Marshall often included sentences altered slightly from the original,[28] and at times entire paragraphs appeared in which the original was "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought". Among these are some of the most lively passages of the *Life*.[29] If, however, some parts show evidence of having been worked over in some degree, there are many passages, both large and small, which follow their model so closely as to be almost word-for-word insertions.[30]

It is clear that Marshall borrowed extensively and flagrantly from the *Annual Register* and Gordon. From them he copied material on every type of subject, civil and military, and in the same crude manner which characterized his practice in Volume I. He might conceivably be defended for using secondary accounts as he did on the ground that the main outlines of the history of the Revolution had already been written. Marshall, in the preface of his work, admitted that he could add little to the store of facts concerning America's struggle for independence except those relating to Washington's activities. Thus there remains the ques-

[27] *A.R.,* 1776, pp. 156-7; Marshall, II, 377-80, I (revised), 70-1.

[28] *Gordon,* III, 34. But the French were scarcely on board, when a violent gale dispersed the whole fleet; and though the count had ordered seven ships to repair to Hampton road in the Chesapeak; the Marquis de Vaudreuil was the only officer who was able to execute a part of the order.

Marshall, IV, 103. A violent gale immediately came on which dispersed the whole fleet; and, though the count had directed seven sail to repair to Hampton road in Virginia, the marquis de Vaudreuil was the only officer who was able to execute the order.

Also compare the following: *A.R.,* 1777, p. 135, Gordon, II, 233; Marshall, III, 177, I (revised), 168. *A.R.,* 1781, p. 62; Marshall, IV, 358, I (revised), 408. *A.R.,* 1776, p. 154; Marshall, II, 364-5, I (revised), 64-5.

[29] Such a one is the description of André's death. *A.R.,* 1781, p. 45; Marshall, IV, 284, I (revised), 380. Similar examples are: Gordon, I, 239; Marshall, II, 162-3. *A.R.,* 1778, State Papers, pp. 332-3; Marshall, III, 418-9. *A.R.,* 1776, pp. 169-70; Marshall, II, 435-8.

[30] Examples of this are: Gordon, II, 232; Marshall, III, 176-7, I (revised), 168. *A.R.,* 1777, pp. 125-6; Marshall, III, 125. Gordon, III, 254-5; Marshall, IV, 478. Gordon, III, 129-31; Marshall, IV, 280-1. *A.R.,* 1779, p. 194; Marshall, IV, 79. *A.R.,* 1779, pp. 188-9; Marshall, IV, 62-4. *A.R.,* 1779, pp. 183-4; Marshall, IV, 33-4. *A.R.,* 1779, p. 218; Marshall, IV, 135. *A.R.,* 1779, p. 220; Marshall, IV, 142-3.

tion of how much and with what standards of scholarship he used Washington's papers.

It is at once apparent that he employed quotation marks more extensively with this material. Only about thirty pages of Washington's correspondence, however, are quoted in each volume of almost five hundred pages. Judging from the samples tested, these passages within quotation marks are accurately reproduced.[31] In some places Marshall paraphrased Washington's letters. An example of this is his account of the battle of Monmouth, which is obviously a paraphrase of Washington's letter which had been published in Almon.[32] Though it is of course exceedingly difficult to determine what proportion of the work consists of such paraphrased versions of Washington's correspondence, it certainly is a very small fraction of the whole.

The difficulty is caused by Marshall's curious habits with quotation marks. It would be kind to think that his failure to follow correct usage was owing to ignorance of the mechanics of literary composition. Marshall, however, did know the correct use of quotation marks, as is proved by the quoted excerpts from Washington's letters and from occasional congressional acts and resolutions.[33] That he allowed this knowledge to lapse entirely on numerous occasions has been amply demonstrated. This is but part of the story, however, for, between the extremes of the correct use of quotation marks and their non-use, Marshall showed that to him quotation marks were but the whim of the moment.

At times the chief justice borrowed the work of others so exactly that he included in his text the quotation marks he found in his source even though he failed to recognize his own indebtedness by quotation marks.[34] The reverse was as likely to happen, however, and portions of the *Life* fail to include quotation marks which are to be found in the

[31] In Volume I none of Washington's papers are quoted; in Volume II about forty pages are quoted; in Volume III, nine; in Volume IV, thirty-three pages are quoted. In Volume V approximately 190 pages of Washington's writings are quoted in a volume of nearly 800 pages. Moreover, the total number of pages quoted was swelled in this volume by the inclusion of numerous presidential addresses and congressional messages. Marshall corrects Washington's spelling, transposes his words occasionally, and even omits sentences without indication, as is shown by a comparison of his quotations with *The Writings of George Washington*, edited by John C. Fitzpatrick.

[32] John Almon, *The Remembrancer*, 1778, pp. 353-5; Marshall, III, 465-75, I (revised), 252-6. Almon, 1777, pp. 257-8; Marshall, III, 114, I (revised), 148. Gordon, I, 347-8; Marshall, III, 236.

[33] Marshall, II, 425-35, 481-94; III, 398-9.

[34] Gordon, I, 336; Marshall, II, 206. Chalmers, pp. 121-2; Marshall, I, 75. Chalmers, pp. 15, 54-5, Hutchinson, I, 100-6, II, 333-4; Marshall, I, 26, 63-4, 130, 299-300.

source. For example, Chalmers, copying Stith, had the grace to acknowledge the lively phrase, "ninety girls, young and uncorrupt", by quotation marks, but Marshall ignored their use when he appropriated the words.[35] Many similar examples might be cited. Marshall occasionally honored with quotation marks a single paragraph among many he was quoting, and, on the other hand, he at times allowed an unavowed appropriation to slip unnoticed among paragraphs acknowledged by quotation marks.[36]

Marshall's infrequent citations of his authorities are as inconsistent and objectionable as his use of quotation marks. A reference in a footnote generally meant, in fact, a direct appropriation of words as well as facts. By present standards one would not expect to find paragraphs acknowledged only by the simple name of the author, *sans* title, page reference, or quotation marks. Yet Marshall repeatedly copied paragraphs from the works of others, giving only this meager recognition to the authors. Inadequate as such acknowledgment is by modern standards, if followed consistently it would provide the reader with a rough knowledge of the boundaries between the words of Marshall and those of his sources. But even this is denied, for investigation reveals that for all practical purposes the chief justice might almost as profitably have scattered his references at random. They are inaccurate in a variety of ways. Often two or more authors' names are given for a passage which was copied from but one of them.[37] In at least one case Chalmers is the source for which Marshall cites Robertson.[38]

On occasion, Marshall mixed acknowledged and unacknowledged passages indiscriminately. His description of the battle of Camden is an example of this, and, moreover, it appears two pages after a citation of its source.[39] The exposition of the affair at Moore's Creek Bridge is a three-page appropriation of which only a single paragraph is avowed.[40] The descriptions given by Marshall of Canadian and upper New York operations in the Revolution are particularly good evidence of this slipshod practice. The pages depicting these events contain a few acknowledged paragraphs, but they are intermingled with numerous others

[35] Chalmers, p. 46; Marshall, I, 62.

[36] *A.R.*, State Papers, 1778, pp. 332-3; Marshall, III, 418-9. A.R., 1776, pp. 169-70; Marshall, II, 435-8.

[37] Belknap, p. 177; Marshall, I (1805), 245-6. *A.R.*, 1776, pp. 156-7; Marshall, II, 377-80, I (revised), 70-1.

[38] Chalmers, pp. 13-16; Marshall, I, 23-7; I (1805), 23-6; Robertson, III, 213-6.

[39] Marshall, IV, 172-90; I (revised), 343-348.

[40] Marshall, II, 377-80; I (revised), 70-1.

coming from the same sources as the avowed ones, copied in the same manner, yet unacknowledged.[41]

The story of Burgoyne's march on Ticonderoga, as given by Marshall, embodies many of the faults characteristic of the *Life* as a whole. The account is borrowed from the *Annual Register*. The opening paragraph is a loose paraphrase and is acknowledged by Marshall's common method of citing merely the title of the book. The tempo of borrowing is increased thereafter, and for nearly three pages the chief justice copied his authority word for word. Each paragraph was avowed. At the end of the passage, however, he included a few paragraphs without any citation.[42] In view of these practices, the citations of sources given in the *Life of Washington* have no real significance.

If Marshall were called upon to face a charge of plagiarism, he would be found guilty by modern standards upon the evidence thus far presented. There are important considerations, however, which, though they do not enhance the value of the *Life* as scholarly history, might make some believe that it would be unjust to call him a plagiarist. Marshall lived in what Professor Libby has described as "a generation of successfully plagiarized histories",[43] and it is possible to argue that in borrowing the work of other men he was but following accepted historiographical custom. There might be some validity in such a defense, for, after examining many of the histories of his day, one is inclined to believe that the ancient joke concerning the man who did not care to buy a book because he had one, might have some foundation in fact. The dependence of Ramsay and Gordon upon each other and upon the *Annual Register* is known, and Professor Libby has also discovered that a host of the lesser early histories of the Revolution were but copies of that periodical.[44] While, however, the level of the scholarship of these works may have been the common level, there were exceptions. George Chalmers, in his *Political Annals,* gave very full and very precise references to his sources. Marshall used this history for his own work but failed to use its method. Moreover, in 1828, Story, in his review

[41] *A.R.*, 1777, pp. 146-50, Almon, 1777, pp. 348-53; Marshall, III, 223-39. *A.R.*, 1776, pp. 5-6; Marshall, II, 307-8. Almon, 1777, pp. 389-91; Marshall, III, 261-5. *A.R.*, 1776, p. 154; Marshall, II, 363-6.

[42] *A.R.*, 1777, pp. 144-6; Marshall, III, 233-4.

[43] Orin Grant Libby, "Ramsay as a Plagiarist", *American Historical Review,* VII (1902), 703. See also his "A Critical Examination of William Gordon's History of the American Revolution", *Annual Report* of the American Historical Association, 1899, pp. 367 ff.

[44] *Am. Hist. Rev.*, VII, 697.

of Marshall's first volume, expressed a wish that he had given title and page references to his authorities in addition to the bare name of the author.[45] Marshall, however, failed to heed this criticism in his revised edition of the *Life,* published in 1832.

Marshall's best defense against the charge of plagiarism is one that he himself presented when his work was first published. In the preface he warned his readers:

> Doddesley's Annual Register, Belsham, Gordon, Ramsay, and Stedman have for this purpose been occasionally resorted to, and are quoted for those facts which are detailed in part on their authority. Their very language has sometimes been employed without distinguishing the passages especially when intermingled with others, by marks of quotation, and the author persuades himself that this public declaration will rescue him from the imputation of receiving aids he is unwilling to acknowledge, or of wishing, by a concealed plagiarism, to usher, to the world, as his own, the labours of others.[46]

It is on this defense that the chief justice must rest his case for an acquittal of the charge of plagiarism.

In this same preface, however, Marshall made statements and implications that are clearly unwarranted. "In the military part of this history", he wrote, "the author can promise not much which is new. He can only engage for the correctness with which facts are stated, and for the diligence with which his researches have been made".[47] This implies that new material will be found in the non-military parts of the volumes and further promises that the military history has been tested by critical investigation. To what extent this assertion is warranted the reader of the passages quoted above may determine for himself. Again, he says: "But there are many facts . . . connected with those events, in which the general performed a principal part. . . . Such facts have been taken from the histories of the day, and the authority relied on for the establishment of their verity has been cited".[48] This certainly means that citations are to be given, but in fact they were given only in exceptional cases. The statement that the authorities named had been resorted to "occasionally" and their very language "sometimes" employed, is assuredly a marvel of the art of understatement.

The defense based on the prefatory apology in the five-volume editions does not apply to the revised two-volume edition, which Marshall issued a quarter of a century later as the definitive form of his *Washington.* It was to have corrected the inaccuracies which had been

[45] *North Am. Rev.,* XXVI, 40. [46] Marshall, I, x. [47] *Ibid.,* p. ix. [48] *Ibid.,* p. x.

pointed out in the earlier editions, and Beveridge considered it "to this day the fullest and most trustworthy treatment of that period, from the conservative point of view".[49] This later edition contains no apology in its preface, not even an acknowledgment of authorities, yet, as has been proved, Marshall's borrowings were common in this edition also.

Whether or not Marshall's *Washington* should be considered the fruit of plagiarism, the two traditions concerning it which have been held among scholars have clearly no foundation in fact. It is not an outstanding Federalist interpretation of history. There is little of the Federalist in it because there is little of Marshall there. Neither is it "a faithful historical narrative", composed with the "political acumen and . . . judicial equipoise" of "a true historic spirit". On the contrary, it is a work which may mislead the unwary scholar. Paul Leicester Ford was not, as he thought, giving the immortal Marshall's account of Washington's farewell at Fraunce's Tavern but was actually quoting the fallible William Gordon.[50]

Scholars must regret the lost opportunity, for here were the essentials for imperishable history—a great mind and a great theme.

WILLIAM A. FORAN.

The Johns Hopkins University.

[49] Beveridge, III, 271-3.

[50] Paul Leicester Ford, *The True George Washington* (Philadelphia, 1896), pp. 291-2, quoting Marshall, IV, 619-20. *Cf.* Gordon, III, 377.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

Two Official Candidates of the July Monarchy

Writers of textbook histories of modern Europe, allowing themselves only a few pages in which to depict France in the reign of Louis Philippe, have usually made three points and moved on. They have almost all portrayed the July Monarchy as a regime of bourgeois ascendancy, as a period of inactive foreign policy, and as a time when elections to the chamber of deputies were corruptly controlled by the ministerial party. Writers of more detailed histories of internal affairs have naturally developed these characteristic phases of the period and have, as a part of their appointed task, expatiated upon the shortcomings of the electoral system. They have described the election tactics of the Guizot government (1842-48) and have portrayed in greater detail the limits to which a none too honest administration was driven in order to secure the election of ministerial supporters. Even Weil's admirable monograph, however, dedicated to the subject of elections, does not discuss in detail specific instances of official candidature, which, in the last analysis, comprised the matrix of corrupt electoral practice, and around which the multitude of lesser irregularities necessarily revolved.[1] The object of this paper is to present two case studies of official candidature.

Before the revolution of July, 1830, Charles X, his ministers, and the departmental administration employed a great many unethical if not illegal electoral devices arising from the necessity of electing official candidates. Bribery, misuse of public funds, arbitrary denial of civil rights, calumny, and fraud were particularly evident in the national elections of 1827 and 1830. In fact, so desperate were king and administration that during the campaign months they assumed more the role of electoral agents than that of an executive government. Affairs of state were sadly neglected while they worked tirelessly in the interests of their chosen followers, the official candidates. Governmental support of these men was regarded as inimical to the freedom of political expression. In fact, at a time when the franchise was granted to a mere handful of the

[1] Georges Denis Weil, *Les élections legislatives depuis 1789* (Paris, 1895).

wealthier citizens, official candidature was considered lethal to what little value there remained in public elections.[2]

This abuse was a source of great annoyance to the liberals of the Restoration, who realized with painful clarity that official aid was frequently responsible for the election of docile and stupid men whose highest political ambition was to obey orders, vote with the ministry, and reap the rewards of faithful servitude. In fact the liberals were so incensed by the election methods of the government that in 1827 they organized their own electoral societies for the sole purpose of defeating official candidates.

In these circumstances it was to be expected that the liberals and their radical allies, having carried off the revolution of July, 1830, would ask that an end be put to governmental interference with elections. These men, the so-called "patriots of July", regarded the abandonment of official candidature as no more than the rightful reward of their successful *coup d'état*. But with the passing of time and with their decline in governmental influence, they were not long in discovering that electoral conditions were no better than under the former monarchy. They became pained and disgusted to observe that the new controlling group was as willing as the civil servants of Charles X and Polignac to support official candidates and to employ the same dishonest tactics.

That the "patriots" were justifiably angered by the continuance of these abuses is shown by the case of Admyrault, *fils*,[3] son of the prefect of Charente inférieure. This particular instance of official candidature illustrates clearly the devices an administration would employ in order to secure a parliamentary majority.

On the last day of January, 1831, M. Gallot, stanch liberal deputy from La Rochelle (Charente inférieure), resigned from the chamber. Chosen from the electoral district of La Rochelle in June, 1830, his resignation created a vacancy which according to law had to be immediately filled. The president of the chamber therefore notified Montalivet, the minister of the interior, who in turn wrote Admyrault, *père*, the prefect of the department, ordering him to put the electoral machinery in motion.[4] This very first communication indicated that the

[2] The franchise was given to those who were thirty years of age and who paid three hundred francs in direct taxes. Between ninety and one hundred thousand men were able to meet the requirements.

[3] Spelled thus by his father. Spelled "Admiraulde" in A. Robert and G. Cougny, *Dictionnaire des parlementaires français* (Paris, 1889-91).

[4] The correspondence on this election is to be found in the Archives nationales (Paris), F 1C111 Charente inférieure 7, dated between January 31, 1831, and April 5, 1831 (hereafter cited as A.N., Char. inf. 7).

coming election was to have about it an aura of dishonesty, for in it the minister suggested to the prefect that he run off the election using the out-of-date and unrevised electoral lists of November 16, 1830.[5] This suggestion was in contravention of the electoral laws of 1827 and 1828.[6] The minister furthermore wrote that he hoped the prefect would be able to find and elect a candidate of unflagging devotion to the principles of the cabinet. To this letter the prefect replied, reassuring his superior that he was diligently seeking out possible candidates, but that he could not acquiesce in the minister's suggestion as to the "unusual" use of the old electoral lists. He feared that to do so would not be feasible because (1) the lists were already in the process of revision, (2) not to revise them would be to disregard the law, and (3), added with a charming naïveté, the citizens would object to such a thing. This exchange of letters suggests nothing if not the administration's pragmatic attitude towards the sacred right to vote and hold office.

To understand the sequel of this incident one must keep in mind first the time and secondly the stipulations of the ruling electoral laws. At this moment the July Monarchy was some six months old, but it had not yet provided new electoral legislation. Elections such as the one under consideration must therefore be held under a mosaic of legislation, most of which dated from the Restoration.[7] This legislation conferred the franchise upon males of thirty years of age who paid three hundred francs in direct taxes and eligibility to hold office upon those who were forty and paid direct taxes to the amount of one thousand francs. In the three months which followed Gallot's resignation this very legislation was being revised by the chamber of deputies, and it was common political gossip that as soon as the king had signed the new law he would dissolve the chamber and would then quite naturally call for the election of a succeeding chamber according to the provisions of the new law then being drafted.

[5] *Ibid.* This letter is lacking, but its contents may be accurately reconstructed from the prefect's reply, in which he quotes the advice of the minister and then gives his reasons for acceptance or rejection.

[6] These laws demanded that electoral lists be revised by the prefect as decisions on the qualification to vote were rendered by the various *cours d'appel* of the realm. They are dated May 2, 1827, and July 2, 1828, and can be found in J. B. Duvergier, *Collection complète des lois, decrets . . .*, XXVII, 117, and XXVIII, 184.

[7] For an exact picture of the electoral legislation of this period one must consult the charter of 1814 (F. A. Helie, *Les constitutions de la France*, Paris, 1880, p. 884), the law of Feb. 5, 1817 (Duvergier, XXI, 84), the law of June 29, 1820 (*ibid.*, XXIII, 13), the laws of May 2, 1827, and July 2, 1828 (see above n. 6), the charter of 1830 (Helie, p. 987), and the two laws of Sept. 12, 1830 (Duvergier, XXX, 176, 179).

wealthier citizens, official candidature was considered lethal to what little value there remained in public elections.[2]

This abuse was a source of great annoyance to the liberals of the Restoration, who realized with painful clarity that official aid was frequently responsible for the election of docile and stupid men whose highest political ambition was to obey orders, vote with the ministry, and reap the rewards of faithful servitude. In fact the liberals were so incensed by the election methods of the government that in 1827 they organized their own electoral societies for the sole purpose of defeating official candidates.

In these circumstances it was to be expected that the liberals and their radical allies, having carried off the revolution of July, 1830, would ask that an end be put to governmental interference with elections. These men, the so-called "patriots of July", regarded the abandonment of official candidature as no more than the rightful reward of their successful *coup d'état*. But with the passing of time and with their decline in governmental influence, they were not long in discovering that electoral conditions were no better than under the former monarchy. They became pained and disgusted to observe that the new controlling group was as willing as the civil servants of Charles X and Polignac to support official candidates and to employ the same dishonest tactics.

That the "patriots" were justifiably angered by the continuance of these abuses is shown by the case of Admyrault, *fils*,[3] son of the prefect of Charente inférieure. This particular instance of official candidature illustrates clearly the devices an administration would employ in order to secure a parliamentary majority.

On the last day of January, 1831, M. Gallot, stanch liberal deputy from La Rochelle (Charente inférieure), resigned from the chamber. Chosen from the electoral district of La Rochelle in June, 1830, his resignation created a vacancy which according to law had to be immediately filled. The president of the chamber therefore notified Montalivet, the minister of the interior, who in turn wrote Admyrault, *père*, the prefect of the department, ordering him to put the electoral machinery in motion.[4] This very first communication indicated that the

[2] The franchise was given to those who were thirty years of age and who paid three hundred francs in direct taxes. Between ninety and one hundred thousand men were able to meet the requirements.

[3] Spelled thus by his father. Spelled "Admirauldt" in A. Robert and G. Cougny, *Dictionnaire des parlementaires français* (Paris, 1889-91).

[4] The correspondence on this election is to be found in the Archives nationales (Paris), F 1CIII Charente inférieure 7, dated between January 31, 1831, and April 5, 1831 (hereafter cited as A.N., Char. inf. 7).

coming election was to have about it an aura of dishonesty, for in it the minister suggested to the prefect that he run off the election using the out-of-date and unrevised electoral lists of November 16, 1830.[5] This suggestion was in contravention of the electoral laws of 1827 and 1828.[6] The minister furthermore wrote that he hoped the prefect would be able to find and elect a candidate of unflagging devotion to the principles of the cabinet. To this letter the prefect replied, reassuring his superior that he was diligently seeking out possible candidates, but that he could not acquiesce in the minister's suggestion as to the "unusual" use of the old electoral lists. He feared that to do so would not be feasible because (1) the lists were already in the process of revision, (2) not to revise them would be to disregard the law, and (3), added with a charming naïveté, the citizens would object to such a thing. This exchange of letters suggests nothing if not the administration's pragmatic attitude towards the sacred right to vote and hold office.

To understand the sequel of this incident one must keep in mind first the time and secondly the stipulations of the ruling electoral laws. At this moment the July Monarchy was some six months old, but it had not yet provided new electoral legislation. Elections such as the one under consideration must therefore be held under a mosaic of legislation, most of which dated from the Restoration.[7] This legislation conferred the franchise upon males of thirty years of age who paid three hundred francs in direct taxes and eligibility to hold office upon those who were forty and paid direct taxes to the amount of one thousand francs. In the three months which followed Gallot's resignation this very legislation was being revised by the chamber of deputies, and it was common political gossip that as soon as the king had signed the new law he would dissolve the chamber and would then quite naturally call for the election of a succeeding chamber according to the provisions of the new law then being drafted.

[5] *Ibid.* This letter is lacking, but its contents may be accurately reconstructed from the prefect's reply, in which he quotes the advice of the minister and then gives his reasons for acceptance or rejection.

[6] These laws demanded that electoral lists be revised by the prefect as decisions on the qualification to vote were rendered by the various *cours d'appel* of the realm. They are dated May 2, 1827, and July 2, 1828, and can be found in J. B. Duvergier, *Collection complète des lois, decrets . . .*, XXVII, 117, and XXVIII, 184.

[7] For an exact picture of the electoral legislation of this period one must consult the charter of 1814 (F. A. Helie, *Les constitutions de la France*, Paris, 1880, p. 884), the law of Feb. 5, 1817 (Duvergier, XXI, 84), the law of June 29, 1820 (*ibid.*, XXIII, 13), the laws of May 2, 1827, and July 2, 1828 (see above n. 6), the charter of 1830 (Helie, p. 987), and the two laws of Sept. 12, 1830 (Duvergier, XXX, 176, 179).

Knowledge of these facts complicated in certain ways and facilitated in others the task of M. Admyrault, the prefect. The fact that the election he was about to conduct could have no lasting importance was a thing which made his comparatively involved plan feasible. Since imminent dissolution would have certainly prevented the successful candidate's assuming office in the then existing chamber, and since, as he wrote, "It is generally felt that the man who is elected at this time will be re-chosen at the next election, because the voters will regard their first balloting as pledge of their confidence",[8] an otherwise ineligible man might be considered. This man, he went on to explain, was his own son, who at the time was serving king and country in Algiers, and who, of five possible candidates, was the only one unable to meet the property qualifications for eligibility. Unfortunately his direct taxes amounted to not more than 850 francs. Since the chamber of deputies alone could question the validity of an election, the prefect reasoned, and since the present chamber would be dissolved before it could judge his son's case, why not elect him at this time and thus assure his re-election to the future chamber? "For although he is ineligible to serve as deputy now, the coming elections will be held under the new electoral law which we have heard will demand of eligibles a payment of only five hundred francs in direct taxes." To phrase his meaning a little less elegantly, the prefect was suggesting that an election be carried on in direct violation of the law since there was no danger of being caught.

The minister received the prefect's letter and worked out a reply, the draft of which with significant emendations and deletions is still in existence. "Of the two most desirable candidates whom you have named", he wrote, "either M. ——— or your son will be a satisfactory choice. . . . *And as the imminent dissolution of the chamber will seemingly impede the verification of the credentials of those deputies elected in the next few days, the disadvantages of an irregular election are less grave than under other circumstances.*" The italicized sentence has been scratched out and the following one, considerably more equivocal, has been substituted. "As to the validity of the election, it is the duty of the chamber to pass upon the eligibility of its members."[9]

A few days before the dissolution of the chamber the electoral college of La Rochelle chose as its representative Admyrault, *fils*, the prefect's son. The only overt sign of the irregularity of the proceeding was to be

[8] Mar. 30, 1831, A.N., Char. inf. 7.

[9] A.N., Char. inf. 7. It is to be noted that Montalivet was replaced as minister of the interior by Casimir Perrier on March 13, 1831, and that this letter is the latter's.

found in the procès verbal of the election, where, in the place reserved for the entry of the candidate's tax payments, was written, "is inscribed on the electoral lists for 833.50 francs". The new deputy did not go to Paris. He was still in North Africa.

The succeeding weeks proved the father to be an excellent prophet. On April 19, 1831, the new electoral law received the king's signature, and the next day ordinances were issued which dissolved the chamber and called new elections. In July, when these took place under the reduced *cens* of eligibility (five hundred instead of one thousand francs), Admyrault, *fils,* was re-elected even more sensationally than his father had prognosticated. He not only received the mandate of the voters of the city of La Rochelle but was elected simultaneously by a second electoral college, which was composed of the voters from the rural parts of the district.[10] On September 14, 1831, he landed on French soil, resigned as deputy from the second electoral district, and took his seat in the chamber as the accredited representative of La Rochelle *intra muros.*[11]

The incident serves well to demonstrate the minister of the interior's willingness to assist the cause of an official candidate in disobedience of the law and the charter he had sworn to uphold. A pragmatist could take considerable satisfaction in the success of Admyrault, *fils.* Such would be denied him in the equally dishonest but much less fruitful official candidature of Charles Guillaume Hello.

In 1837 Môlé, recently appointed to the presidency of the council and supported by the barest of parliamentary majorities, was exceedingly desirous of stabilizing his position in the chamber by going to the country. In June he decided to call a general election for the autumn, and soon after this decision was made the departmental administration began to receive word that the success of official candidates was of great importance. Prefects and subprefects whose electoral districts had in 1834 returned opposition deputies expected just such news. Well they knew that their continuance in office was likely to depend upon the successful campaign of a ministerial supporter. And it was knowledge of this very fact that made Fromant, subprefect of Ploërmel, and Lorois,

[10] Needless to say, one of the changes effected by the law of April, 1831, was a redistribution of seats in the chamber. Administrative districts (*arrondissements*), such as La Rochelle, which were named after the large city they encompassed, were split into two (or more) electoral districts and accordingly awarded two (or more) deputies. Usually, and this was true of La Rochelle, the city itself provided one electoral college (*intra muros*) and the surrounding country, the second (*extra muros*).

[11] *Moniteur universel,* Aug. 21, Sept. 14, 21, 1831.

prefect of the department of Morbihan, particularly eager to have a potential winner stand as official candidate from the subprefect's district. For in 1834 the independent Breton voters of Ploërmel had chosen M. de Sivry, a man of outspoken opposition to the conservative cabinets and a strong supporter of the left center group. To defeat Sivry was essential.

Charles Guillaume Hello, author of some pamphlets on constitutional government and long associated with the administration of justice in Brittany, resigned his office in order to accept a higher position in the judicial hierarchy.[12] Soon after his promotion the chamber adjourned, and during its summer recess it was dissolved. In October, 1837, the king issued an ordinance calling the general election for the week of November 4-11.

Hello, either a volunteer candidate or drafted by the two administrative officers, Fromant and Lorois, agreed to accept the role of official candidate. The subprefect and prefect thereupon embarked upon a most active canvass for votes. Sivry, the opposition candidate, describing the campaign tactics of the two, spoke in no uncertain terms of their rascality. He told how they had promised administrative sinecures to the faithful, appropriations for the construction of public works to loyal communities, and to one voter the release of his imprisoned son.[13] To be sure, his testimony was violently biased, and at the time he was capable of saying anything of a derogatory nature. But however unusual these accusations may seem, they are no more picturesque than hundreds of others, better substantiated and made at various election periods in different parts of the realm. In fact they may all be true, for the minister of the interior, at a later date, when interpellated on the floor of the chamber, did not deny the charges. His only statement on this matter was that the public was indeed gullible to believe in such promises.[14]

By the last week in October the prefect and subprefect through constant effort appeared to be on the point of attaining their end. M. Hello, the official candidate, appeared almost certain of election. But they had

[12] His actual title was *procureur général du roi près de la cour royale à Rennes*. The court sitting at Rennes had jurisdiction over the departments of the Côtes du Nord, the Ille et Villaine, the Finistère, the Loire inférieure, and the Morbihan. His appointment to this post dated from September, 1830. The new position was that of *avocat général à la cour de cassation* (sitting of course in Paris). Announcement of the appointment was made in the *Moniteur* on May 28, 1837, p. 1 as of May 27. At the same time the appointment of his successor at Rennes was made public.

[13] Published first in an open letter which the *National* (Paris) reprinted on November 7, 1837; later incorporated into a speech delivered before the chamber (*Moniteur*, Jan. 9, 1838).

[14] See the speech of Montalivet, minister of the interior, *ibid.*

failed to count on the active investigation of Sivry. Sometime during the summer the latter had looked into the eligibility of his rival and had discovered the interesting fact that his resignation from the court at Rennes was dated May 27, 1837. Now the electoral law specifically stated that *procureurs généraux* were ineligible for election to the chamber from electoral districts lying within their jurisdiction during the six months which followed the day of their resignation.[15] Since Hello had been a *procureur général,* since Ploërmel lay within his former jurisdiction, and since his resignation was a bare five months old, he was ineligible. On October 28, 1837, one week before the scheduled convocation of the electoral colleges, Sivry published his findings and made public the reasons for Hello's ineligibility.

Fromant and Lorois, in view of their positions, must certainly have known of these before their publication but doubtless had hoped to conceal them. Only a postponement of the election could now save Hello. If they could gain a month, his ineligibility would cease, and he would be able to stand before the electorate as an acceptable candidate. Chance or well-planned design actually effected the desired postponement.

Under these conditions it was curious that on the night after the publication of Hello's ineligibility (October 29-30) the subprefecture at Ploërmel was gutted by fire. All of the carefully compiled election lists and electoral data were completely destroyed. No documentary evidence, except the subsequent accusations of Sivry, remains today to convict either Fromant or Lorois of arson. But since all the burned documents were filed in duplicate at Vannes (only two hours' distant) it is not without significance that neither availed himself of them. Whether the fire was an act of God or not, cannot be determined, but to credit it to Providence is to absolve gratuitously two desperately interested men.

The morning after the fire Fromant ostentatiously communicated with the prefect, who at once telegraphed the minister of the interior, asking an ordinance of postponement. The telegram went out on the semaphore, the most rapid means of communication, and arrived in Paris on a Sunday, when ministers are least likely to be at work, and on the same day the desired ordinance was dispatched for Ploërmel. The document reset the election for the week of December 1-8.

The campaign, to the sorrow of the administrative officers, was resumed with ever-diminishing returns. Sivry, using the fire as a point of departure, was able to carry on a more and more effective battle for

[15] Law on elections, Apr. 19, 1831, §64, Duvergier, XXXI, 211.

support. The election took place at the appointed time, and Hello received so few votes that he withdrew his candidacy after the first ballot, yielding the field to Sivry and a dark horse from the Legitimist party. Sivry received the necessary absolute majority on the second roll call.[16] With this the story might have ended had the government had its way.

But it did not end, for Sivry's anger at the tactics of the administration led him to deliver an impassioned invective before the chamber which so involved cabinet and administration that it required official rebuttal.[17] Montalivet, who had only recently received his portfolio as minister of the interior for the third time, rose to the defense of his henchmen. The occasion demanded subtlety, and the experienced minister was equal to the situation. His tactics displayed a superb use of the unexpected. In the first place he denied none of Sivry's charges against prefect and subprefect: he contented himself with pointing out, as already indicated, that the people of Ploërmel were stupid to have believed the promises, which quite obviously neither officer had power to fulfill. In the second place he completely disarmed Sivry by shifting the field of the discussion. He made no attempt to debate the question of eligibility; he stated indeed that Hello was not only ineligible on November 27, but that he had continued to remain ineligible until December 9. This admitted fact proved the innocence of the government's intentions. For it was quite obvious that Hello could not have assumed office even if duly chosen by the electoral college which had assembled on December 1. What ground was there, he asked, to suppose that cabinet and administration were concerned in the election of this candidate when they had not set the election date sufficiently far ahead to give him the necessary eligibility? Why had they summoned the college as early as December 1 when the law allowed a convocation as late as the twelfth?

Sivry, among other members of the chamber, could not answer the question, for he was fully conscious of the brilliance of the minister's

[16] *Tableau comparatif des élections* (Paris, 1837). Bibliothèque nationale Catalogue, Le^{54}1048.

[17] Indeed so insulting was his criticism of Lorois, the prefect of the Morbihan, that the latter felt impelled to settle the dispute on the field of honor. A duel was fought with more than ordinary zeal, and Lorois received a quite serious sword wound in the thigh. Word of the fight reached official ears, and the combatants were arrested for breach of the law of April 20, 1810, and sections 128-9 of the *Code d'instruction criminel*. The case was first tried at Rennes, the finding of the court nullified by the *Cour de Cassation*, and the case was eventually sent before the *Cour royale* sitting at Rouen. There, far from the scene of action, both were declared guilty, and each was fined one hundred francs. *Moniteur*, Jan. 10, Sept. 27, Oct. 22, Nov. 29, 1838, and Nov. 16, 1839.

quibble. He realized that Montalivet was not dating Hello's leaving Rennes from his promotion of May 27 but from the day when he was officially pushed from office by the appearance of his successor. According to the administrative law no man was in possession of his office until he had gone through the induction ceremony.[18] Hello's successor had not been inducted until June 9, so meanwhile the incumbent continued in possession.[19]

The most serious accusation that could be made against the minister was his refusal to meet the charges which Sivry had made. His rebuttal did not show any desire to extirpate the objectionable practice of official candidature. In fact the answer only made the members of the opposition more aware than they had been of the tragic weakness of the minority position. The lack of confidence that such a reply engendered led the opposition to wonder how the minister would have dealt with the situation had Hello been elected on December 1. It did not take a very astute parliamentarian to realize that Montalivet could have put up as strong a defense for Hello's eligibility as for his ineligibility, and that had he been chosen, his election most certainly would have been validated by an equally equivocal defense.

These two candidatures among scores of similar instances may serve to illustrate the common frustration of free political expression even before Guizot's advent to power. They may explain the almost yearly demands for electoral reform brought before the legislatures of the July Monarchy and may account as well for Duvergier de Hauranne's impassioned plea in 1847 for laws making possible the prosecution of electoral fraud. Probably more than anything else in the politics of the era of Louis Philippe, official candidature shook men's faith in the *régime censitaire*, and probably more than anything else it rekindled in February, 1848, the "patriotic" spirit of the days of July, 1830.

Yale University. SHERMAN KENT.

[18] A. Carpentier and G. du Saint, *Répertoire du droit français* (Paris, 1886-1906), XXIX, *Organization judiciaire*, §436.

[19] There is another equally plausible and somewhat more complicated explanation. First, it could be legally construed that Hello remained in possession of his office in Rennes until relieved or *otherwise rendered ineligible to hold the office*. This ineligibility may well have arisen on June 9 when he was inducted into his new post in the *Cour de Cassation*, for the administrative law did not permit a man to hold two judicial offices at one time (*ibid.*, §397). And Hello's admission to *Cassation* could be considered as automatically severing his connections with the court at Rennes. This ruling would have held even if his successor at Rennes had not taken office until an even later date.

DOCUMENTS

Federalist Jeremiahs

The Old Tioga Point Historical Museum of Athens, Pennsylvania, contains a surprisingly large number of documents which are of more than local interest. Among them is a group of letters from which the following are selected. These letters relate primarily to the management of a landed estate of about 100,000 acres, located in the states of New York and Pennsylvania. The estate was the property of a Frenchman, James LeRay du Chaumont, who had invested in American lands at the time of the flight of French capital to America during the French Revolution.

As time went on, LeRay became "land poor". His financial difficulties led him to associate others with him in the control of the estate. Among them were Nicholas Biddle and Gouverneur Morris. These letters are chosen from those exchanged by Gouverneur Morris and Joseph Kingsberry, the local agent in active management of the lands. Written in 1815 and 1816, the last two years of Morris's life, they illustrate his bitter opposition to the War of 1812, his dissatisfaction with the American Union and, more particularly, with the development of the American Constitution in practice. They are also an interesting example of a business correspondence, enlivened by varied comments on the public affairs of both the United States and Europe, and reflect the personal care which Morris gave to his business affairs up to the close of his life.

Elizabeth Brook.

Randolph-Macon Woman's College.

I. Gouverneur Morris to Joseph Kingsberry

Morrisania March 22, 1815

Sir:—

. . . . . .

Peace has come suddenly and, to those who had faith in the administration, unexpectedly; for they supposed the war was to be prosecuted tho the objects for which it was declared were abandoned. But those who know our Rulers viewed their boastful preparations as one of the bullying tricks to catch gulls, and supposed that, in the midst of their threats, orders were sent to accept of whatever terms the enemy should offer. Time will show whether this nation was cowed. This, however, [is] certain that we have terminated

a foolish war by a wretched peace. The general joy at hearing a treaty was concluded, without enquiring into the terms, proves suffering and discontent notwithstanding specious appearances and loud professions. The loss of our fishery along the coast of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland is a serious misfortune to our Eastern Brethren, even if we lose no more.

I am Sir
Your obedient Servant
GOUV. MORRIS

II. KINGSBERRY TO MORRIS

Sheshequin 27th of March, 1815

Dear Sir:—

. . . . . .

"The ox Knoweth his owner, and ass his master's crib"; but the American people do not know, nor will they understand their rulers. Peace has indeed come suddenly, and it [is] full as good as could be expected from such rulers. It is a parallel with the war; and if the administration can cram this war, and this peace down the throats of the sober and thinking part of the Democrats (if any such there be) they are indeed blinder than the ass and ought to be fed on Madison's communications to Congress, congratulating that body, on the return of peace; which by the bye was the greatest insult ever offered to the American people; and how the minority in Congress could pass it over with so little notice, is to me perfectly astonishing. If it disgraced nobody but Madison; I should care nothing about it; but it is a disgrace to the American Name. O Washington! look down from Heaven on thy people inspire thy spirit into them; Suffer them not any longer to be gulls but like young eagles, new fledged may they float above the groveling imps of Democracy.

My spirit is too much disturbed to write on this subject with propriety at this time excuse me; and believe me to be

Very respectfully
Your most obedient servant
JOSEPH KINGSBERRY

III. MORRIS TO KINGSBERRY

Morrisania 30 March 1815

Dear Sir:—

. . . . . .

Our country is too large for our Constitution. This is perhaps the Reason why our Rulers alter and piece it every Day. Many Precautions are found in it to secure to the People the Choice of the President. It being evident that if the Choice were left to a general Election it would be a wild Business. The State legislatures were called in, for wisdom's sake, to choose Electors etc. etc. It was generally admitted that if chosen by Congress he would be the Tool of a dominant Faction. It was, moreover, demonstrable that a factious majority might, by means of the presidential Patronage perpetuate its Existence. But that the People would so soon and so generally be corrupted was not foreseen. And even if it had been, what would have been done to prevent the mischief? Nothing effectual: for if anything effectual had been proposed by the Convention it would not have been adopted by the States—

well how stands the Presidential Election; not in the printed Papers but in the living world, in the land we call a Republic? The People have no more to say in it than their Horses. The matter is settled by members of Congress, at Washington, in the worst of all possible ways, because not one of those who make the Choice is accountable.

Remedies more radical than those devised at Hartford must be adopted or The Day of Despotism is not far off, but what those Remedies are it would be idle for us to enquire. The Enquiry would indeed, be doubly useless because, in the varying Scenes of Life, what is good at one Time and in one Condition is frequently ruinous in another; of which we can have no more striking Proof than the Constitution itself. It was the means by which, under Washington, Our Nation rose to wealth and glory, and by which, under his Successors, it has sunk to Poverty and Shame. Mr. Pope was right as far as he went in saying

> "For Forms of Government let
> Fools contest,
> Whatever is best administered
> Is best."

He ought however to have added

> "But Ruin threatens that devoted
> Nation which form subjects
> to mal administration."

I am truly yours,
Gouv. Morris

P.S. Direct your Letters to *West Farms* near New York.

IV. Morris to Kingsberry

Morrisania 22 June 1815

Dear Sir:—

. . . . . .

You seem to suppose it next to impossible that Party Spirit should lead men to applaud the Treaty of Peace after having applauded a war undertaken to establish Claims every one of which has been abandoned. Party Spirit, my Dear Sir, can do and has already done, more. It has induced a Majority of Congress not only to assert Facts in the Face ot Evidence, but to act on such rash assertions, the Hand of History will point to more than one Instance.

Your alarm respecting Bonaparte is, I think, too great. Louis deserved in some measure what happened. I apprehended trouble and Turmoil. Tho not so great a Catastrophe; for the man who lies down naked among Rattlesnakes must expect to be bitten. It is, however, more easy to discover Faults than to avoid them. He ought, if he could, to have disbanded an army which, habituated to Plunder was not susceptible of pacific Temper. But could he? Was he not, in sort, a Prisoner in Their Hands? The Allies [should] have considered the Situation before they placed him in it. But they, I suppose reasoned on what they saw from what they felt. Alexander who took the lead, has still in his Head some of that stuff called Philosophy which it was full of ten years ago. And all of them seem to have taken for granted that a maxim not always correct in a State of Peace is applicable to a State of War: viz that one nation ought not to meddle with the internal affairs of another. The

Romans would have laughed at this Childishness. Their Maxim was Salus Populi Suprema Lex; which, carried to its consequences, and exemplified by their Practice, meant the Destruction of every thing incompatible with Interest. There has been uttered of late, much idle jargon on subjects of this Sort. Among the Rest, it has been triumphantly asked, as if unanswerable, would you make war against Principles. To this I have frequently had occasion to reply Yes: and to destroy Principles inconsistent with the Peace and Happiness of mankind, not those who hold them.

Providence whose ways are inscrutable by men, has brought the allies, now, to a Condition in which they must act up to that opinion. Bonaparte will be quelled and his associate conspirators brought to condign Punishment. I am moreover disposed to believe that ere long, Jacobin Doctrines will be put down everywhere. The Family of Nations must not be tormented by the vain and [*MS. illegible*] waywardness of a presumptuous member. Those who, like Napoleon, deny the Law, must, like Napoleon, be put out of the Law.

I am respectfully
Dr Sir
Your obedient servant
Gouv. Morris

V. Morris to Kingsberry

Morrisania, 19 Dec. 1815

Dear Sir:

. . . . . .

In the midst of contradictory accounts from France, it seems evident that, that nation is Pride-sick. People are naturally out of Humor at receiving instead of dictating the Law. That tract of Country always produced a turbulent Race. Caesar or Tacitus, I forget which, characterized them as "too proud to obey too ferocious to be free". A firm hand is needful to govern them. Their Ruler must flatter their Vanity and punish severely the slightest attempt to diminish his authority. The Adherents of Bonaparte will doubtless contrast the splendor of his achievements with the present, the humiliation of Frenchmen. Ignorance may be persuaded that a few dozen Eagles with tricolored Flags and Cockades would expel foreign Troops and plunder foreign Countries. This mode of acquiring wealth is more agreeable to them than honest Industry. The Ministers, like some other Rulers, flatter the popular Taste tho they know that, far from being gratified, it must be corrected. France, like a vicious Horse with a curb, may kick or plunge but the whip and spur, well applied, will tame her. Unfortunately her king is too mild and feels hurt at being a Dependant on foreign troops without whose Presence nevertheless, the Rashness of his Friends, the subtlety of his Foes, the Treachery of many and the arrogance of all would send him again into Exile. Should this happen, neighboring Powers may divide that country, restoring to the Netherlands what was taken by Louis the XIV and reestablishing the ancient kingdom of Burgundy; to include the Province of that name with Lorraine-Alsace and Franche-Comte. This, or the Establishment of a New Dynasty in France would be a sore stroke to us who are interested in preserving, by the Union of France with Spain, a counterbalance to the weight of Britain. Russia has and Prussia had the same Interest; but Prussia can now stand alone. When the Russian Troops shall have reached their own

Country, they will be too far off, to prevent, in the present State of France, such Dismemberment as Austria, Prussia, England and Holland may find convenient. The Business once effected, cannot be undone by growling or fighting in the North.

As to our Jacobins, you will have seen, by my last, that I have little hope of their amendment. If they do not split, they will probably name the next President. The best chance therefore, to prevent Mr. Monroe's Election is in the Ambition of rival demagogues. A chance at Washington will settle the matter until the mode of Election be changed. Such change would require other Changes to render Freedom secure. But alas; when Democracy has reached a certain Height there is little chance for the Duration of Freedom. Circumstances or, to speak more properly, Providence may produce changes both of men and Things which Reason can neither direct nor foresee.

With esteem & Respect I am Dr Sir

Your obedient servant

Gouv. Morris

VI. Kingsberry to Morris

Sheshequin, January 2, 1816

Dear Sir:—

. . . . . .

I am greatly obliged to you for the accompaniment for the seventh number. I believe it difficult to foresee the probable result of the turmoil in France. A division as you have suggested, in case the present king is removed would be more probable than a new dynasty. I acknowledge the latter would tend more to keep up the balance of power in Europe and of course would be better for us. But I am very much mistaken if Spain is not tottering a little. The vigilance necessary to keep down rebellion at home, will lessen the means & exertions to quell disturbances in the Colonies, where there seems to be a spirit of revolt and where nothing but wisdom is wanting to bring about a separation from the mother country. The Spanish Americans are too ignorant to govern themselves, and on this score Spain may hold them some time longer.

I believe, as you say, we must leave our affairs to Providence. At least no means that have been used seem to open the eyes of the people. "They are led to believe a lie that they may be damned". But the worst of it is those who perceive the multitude going to the devil, cannot avoid being drawn into the gulf along with them.

I am truly, Dr Sir, with the greatest esteem

yours

Jos. Kingsberry

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL AND ANCIENT HISTORY

Les trois races de l'Europe et du monde: Leur génie et leur histoire. Par Paul Buyssens. (Brussels: Éditions Purnal. 1936. Pp. 270. 9 belgas.)

There seems to be no end to racial vagaries. We have lived through an era of Aryanism dominated by Count de Gobineau's *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines.* This was followed by the Teutonism, a transfigured Aryanism, of Houston Stewart Chamberlain's *Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts,* which presently blossomed forth as a mystical doctrine of Pan-Germanism. The national antagonisms engendered during the World War crystallized in Anglo-Saxon countries as the doctrine of Nordic superiority, known also as the "Nordic myth", represented in this country by such writers as Madison Grant, Lothrop Stoddard, and Albert Edward Wiggam, with William McDougall making up the rear guard. This doctrine, now flourishing in a Neo-Germanic garb in Hitler's Germany, is no longer so popular with Anglo-Saxon peoples, but it left in its wake the immigration policy of the United States, a policy as vicious in its theoretical basis as it is proving disastrous in its practical consequences.

And now comes this book by a Belgian, Paul Buyssens, which shuffles the racial cards once more with the result that the Mediterranean race—the other two being the Nordic and the Negro—is elevated to superior status. In fairness to the author let it be said that the spirit of his book is free from prejudice, in the narrower sense. There is here no rancor, no vicious fanaticism, merely a mild form of insanity.

The three races, Mediterranean, Nordic, and Negro, are to be strictly distinguished in their psychological equipment and cultural contribution. The Mediterraneans, richly endowed with the "cortical principle" (pp. 23-4), are the thinkers par excellence. There are only three systems of thought in the world, we are told, namely the superstition of the Negro, the objectivity of the Nordic, and the reason of the Mediterranean (p. 159), as illustrated by the French.

The Mediterranean is the inventor of geometrical art (which to the author spells abstraction). He gave us the art of writing; his special mission is to transmute the brass of inferior races into the gold of thought (pp. 34-6); being superior, he does not readily yield to the influence of other races and tends to remain segregated (p. 67); he dislikes agriculture (p. 134). Practical matters generally, which require concentrated attention to externals, are not congenial to him. It must be understood, however, that when he

neglects to provide for his practical needs, it is because he is too busy thinking (pp. 143, 147). Deeply synthetic, he strives for political unity. Nor should we be misled by the notorious instability of French governments; this instability is due to the Mediterranean's idealism, which prompts him to try and try again in a restless search for the ideal society (pp. 156-7). The Mediterranean is cruel. Concentration on the inner workings of the "cortical principle" is not compatible with too attentive a regard for others (p. 208). If the ancient Mexicans were more cruel than the Mayas of Yucatan, this was because of the admixture of North Africans (Mediterraneans). Also, this thought-laden man steals: he has no eyes for the rights or possessions of others.

The Nordic, by contrast, is materialistic. He is practical. This trait, be it noted, he derives from the Negro admixture in his blood (p. 149). He is also altruistic and progressive in consequence of his practical-minded attention to things and to people (p. 148).

The Negro, though natively inferior to the Mediterranean and the Nordic, bestowed great gifts upon world culture. He is the naturalistic artist (p. 105); but when his art is geometrical, as so often in Africa, Mediterranean blood must be held responsible (p. 103). He invented agriculture (p. 138), the domestication of animals, ceramics, navigation, and the use of metals (p. 152). Still, inferior he remains unless raised to higher status through infusion of Mediterranean blood, as in North Africa or among the Zulus (p. 125).

So much for psychology and culture. But we should not neglect the physical side of race, to which many sections of the book are devoted. In the beginning was the pygmy (p. 29). As is well known, he survives in his pristine form in different parts of the world. But he also evolved to produce the Mediterranean and Nordic and the tall Negroes of Africa. Moreover, he became adapted, *without evolution,* to the frigid climates of central and northern Asia, to emerge as the yellow man, the Mongolian of other racial classifications (see the graph on p. 34). The Negro, Mediterranean, and Nordic, the three pure dolichocephalic races, we read, all evolved from the pygmies, interbred to produce the mixed races: the Occidental (Mediterranean and Nordic, roughly corresponding to the familiar Alpine), the Dinaric (Nordic and Negro), and the Littoral (Negro and Mediterranean, p. 63). The first two are brachycephalic, the last is mesocephalic. Brachycephaly thus emerges as the inevitable consequence of the mixture of dolichocephals (pp. 59, 61), and of this alone; there are no original brachycephals.

On two occasions, in prehistoric times, when warmer climate permitted, the Negro invaded Europe; there were two similar invasions by the Mediterraneans and two more by the Nordics, when the climate was cold (p. 55). Thus came about those mixtures of racial stocks, puzzling to so many but apparently not at all confusing to our author, who seems to possess the magic

key with which to reduce all such difficulties to clarity and simplicity. It need not be added that racial identifications throughout the heavily documented volume are achieved by means of the well-tried method of using a few instances, or even a single skeletal find, as proof of the presence of a racial group, without any regard for the fact of anatomical variability within each race. If space permitted, it could be shown how a crude diffusionism and an equally crude environmentalism are used, again and again, to fill in the gaps in the argument.

The author seems to possess to an eminent degree the quality of concentration on synthetic thought, ascribed by him to the Mediterranean, with its associated reduction of attention to concrete external particulars. The whole performance is characterized by a singularly placid disregard of method and of the rules of harnessing evidence. Perhaps we might ascribe these traits to a remote pygmoid inheritance.

University of Wisconsin. ALEXANDER GOLDENWEISER.

The Social Thought of the Ancient Civilizations. By JOYCE O. HERTZLER, Professor of Sociology, University of Nebraska. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. 1936. Pp. xv, 409. $4.00.)

THIS work is a compendium of materials objectively presented and designed not for the historian but for the social scientist, to extend his sources to the pre-Greek civilizations and to aid him to derive the "societal universals" on which his science is based. It does not pretend to original scholarship, philological or historical; it includes standard translations, and in attempting to avoid critical controversies it tends to draw on the older literature, largely in English, on the ancient East. These texts and interpretations it classifies and organizes in terms of the categories of present American sociology. There are sections on the social thought of the Egyptians, the Babylonians, the Assyrians and Hittites, the Persians, the ancient Hindus and Chinese, and the Hebrews.

In the author's intention, "social thought" is sharply distinguished from "moral, religious, or political thinking". It deals with the nature of social relationships and institutions, the requirements for social order, the principles of social policy, and all traits of social significance; it originates when men begin to generalize about social relationships in a verifiable form. In fact, the material given is largely moral; but the total exclusion of anything with a religious bearing eliminates much that would seem relevant and gives a novel impression of these cultures. This exclusion, together with the author's concentration upon the "fundamental concepts" of social science as they appear here, places the emphasis upon "the universal and omnipresent aspects of social relationships in a stratified society" and minimizes any characteristic differences. The homely wisdom cited is indeed universal and leads to the underlining of common elements, parallels of thought, and uni-

formities of social routines. Interesting as is the grouping of these various precepts, they display no concern with the "philosophical and scientific aspects of behavior" and do not seriously threaten the author's own admission that "the systematic discussion of social phenomena begins with the post-Socratic Greeks". It is true that "the modern student of Greek culture sees it as a compounding of elements derived from the entire Mediterranean area". One suspects that what was "peculiarly Greek", and what lay close to the secret of the originality and power of Greek "social thought", was the fact that the Greeks saw their own culture in the same way.

As a textbook and a compilation of source materials this work has been competently done. Its judgments and evaluations, however, as in the concluding estimate of Chinese social thought, strike one as rather provincial and unimaginative.

Columbia University. JOHN HERMAN RANDALL, JR.

Prelude to Chemistry: An Outline of Alchemy, its Literature and Relationships. By JOHN READ, Professor of Chemistry in the United College of St. Salvator and St. Leonard in the University of St. Andrews. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1937. Pp. xxiv, 327. $5.00.)

PROFESSOR Read's book succeeds admirably, better than any other book with which we are acquainted, in conveying a correct understanding of the theories of early chemistry and alchemy, of their probable origins, of their nature and development, and of their affiliations. It is these affiliations, the extra-chemical involvements of early chemistry, which constitute its avowed subject matter. Necessarily expounded in their relations to chemical and alchemical theories, they illuminate those theories with a light which cannot otherwise be thrown upon them. The book in consequence is characterized by an exceptionally accurate insight into the effective processes of early chemistry. It shows how the central doctrine operated in the laboratory and also how it operated in the minds of the laboratory workers in their imaginative and metaphorical language, their curious diagrams and symbolic pictures.

The first chapter, "An Outline of Alchemy", discusses briefly the difficulty of defining alchemy, the evidences for its Chinese origin, early metallurgy in Egypt, the imitative arts of the Alexandrian chemists and the "transmutation by color" theory of Hopkins, the Islamic era, the European era, and the era of phlogiston. The second, on "The Literature of Alchemy", contains sections on the "Sum of Perfection", the Emerald Table of Hermes, the "New Pearl of Great Price", the alchemical hieroglyphics of Nicholas Flamel, the *Splendor solis,* symbols, emblems, and cryptic expressions, the hylozoistic conception, the masculine and feminine principles, and the relations of alchemy to astrology and religion. The third chapter discusses the

philosopher's stone in a manner which makes intelligible the language, the diagrams, and the symbolic pictures by which the alchemists were accustomed to represent its preparation and properties. The fourth describes the "Hermetic Museum" and two of the three "nurslings of the wealthy art" of the *Tripus aureus,* namely Thomas Norton of Bristol and John Cremer, abbot of Westminster. The fifth discusses the third member of the triad, the pseudonymous Basil Valentine, his "Triumphal Chariot of Antimony", his "Last Will and Testament", and "Twelve Keys". The sixth deals chiefly with the musical alchemist, Count Michael Maier, and with the emblems which illustrate his writings, particularly *Atalanta fugiens,* which contains both symbolic pictures and alchemical music. The seventh and last chapter discusses the *Viridarium chymicum* and *Hortulus hermeticus flosculis philosophorum* of Stolcius and the *Philosophia reformata* of Mylius. Read finds that all of Stolcius's emblems from I to XCIII may be "traced back to works published by Lucas Jennis at Frankfurt, between the years 1618 and 1622, and written by Maier or Mylius".

The book is scholarly, interesting, and attractive. It is written in a fine literary style, pervaded by the author's gentle sense of humor and sympathetic insight. An appendix contains an essay on "The Music in Atalanta Fugiens" by F. H. Sawyer, together with several of the fugues arranged in the modern manner for choral singing, a glossary, a bibliography, and notes. The work is profusely illustrated with a colored frontispiece, 63 other plates, 17 figures, and additional small pictures.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology. TENNEY L. DAVIS.

Essays in History and Political Theory in Honor of Charles Howard McIlwain. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1936. Pp. x, 371. $3.50.)

WHILE it may be said that these twelve essays fall in the two fields of constitutional history and political theory, yet the history of government can hardly be written in any but a superficial way without running into political theory. Professor McIlwain's own work is a striking blend of these related interests, and his disciples are walking in his way. They profess that the unifying thread which holds their essays together "is the golden thread of memory of happy and extraordinarily profitable years spent under the tutelage of a great scholar"; yet the reader becomes convinced that the tutelage is still potent and that there is more of unity than a first glance at titles indicates—more, probably, than the writers themselves have realized. Few volumes compiled in honor of a scholar and teacher really do him honor in so spontaneous and even unconscious a way.

Chronologically the essays range from the Roman Empire to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but the largest number fall in the later Middle Ages and those pregnant early modern centuries, the sixteenth and

seventeenth. Seven of the essays relate to England, two to Western Europe in general, one to the British Empire, one to Rome, and one to the United States.

Of the studies on England or the British Empire four deal largely with parliament. One of special interest and most clearly argued is Professor Paul Birdsall's on "Non Obstante"—the clause most often used in asserting the dispensing power of English kings. From the significant episodes of Edward II's time—Lords Ordainers, New Ordinances, Statute of York (how that old statute has been coming into its own of late!)—there is traced the relation of royal prerogative to statutory restriction until, after 1689, "the effect of the Revolution Settlement as a whole was to transfer the executive authority of the Crown to ministers acting in its name and responsible to Parliament". But another of these essays, that of Professor Margaret Judson, shows that the *theory* of parliamentary sovereignty was fully set forth during the Civil War. Amid the theories of the Puritan Revolution which anticipated so much of recent thought and achievement and upon which so much has been written, it has been rather assumed that legislative sovereignty was a post-Revolutionary product. Here is furnished an analysis of the writings (1640-49) of the rather neglected Henry Parker, who, starting with the prevailing conceptions of fundamental law and limited authority, followed the logic of events and of his own premises and finding "no essential difference between the power of the final interpreter of law and the maker of law, actually worked out for the first time in English history a theory of Parliamentary sovereignty". To Parker, power was originally inherent in the people, but the manner of parliament's derivation of sovereignty from them and its abiding relation to them is a phase of the problem not quite reached in his writings. One wonders whether there had not been more anticipation of Parker's sovereignty idea in the work of Sir Thomas Smith and other mid-Tutor theorists than is here set down. Of the two other essays which touch parliament, Dr. Dorothy Weske's on "the attitude of the English clergy in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries towards the obligation of attendance on Convocations and Parliaments" gives a fuller account than we have had of the withdrawal of the clergy, as clergy, from parliament but is marred throughout by awkward and obscure translations; and Professor Wittke's, on parliamentary privilege in the empire, concludes convincingly that the privileges of the House of Commons, "based on an ancient and separate law and custom of Parliament", were not carried to the colonies as a part of the common law, but that "the privileges of empire legislatures depend on express enactment".

Two essays relate to English legal history. Professor Rezneck's on the trial of treason in Tudor England deals with the modernizing tendencies of the sixteenth century and the paradox of the severe Tudor treason laws and the Tudor sensitiveness to public opinion—all this working towards the

great reforming statute of 1696. When, however, he speaks of state and sovereign "merging into a common conception of political authority", any attack upon which was therefore treason, as something essentially new, and the "amazing distortion of the traditional law" when a king was condemned for treason to the state, there should at least be a reference to those precocious theories dating as far back as Edward II to the effect that the state was something other than and more than the king—a rationalizing of the violence which overtook that king. Dr. Mary Maguire, in dealing with the "attack of the common lawyers on the oath *ex officio* as administered in the ecclesiastical courts in England", takes issue with Wigmore (*Treatise on Evidence*) in believing that even before the sixteenth century there was opposition to the *method* of these courts—*i.e.*, this oath—as well as to the scope of their jurisdiction. This essay, as a whole, traces most satisfactorily the part played by inquisitorial procedure in affording a weapon against ecclesiastical jurisdiction and the courts of royal prerogative and ultimately developing the general legal principle which forbids self-incrimination. Yet the reader occasionally wishes for a clearer distinction between *ex officio* as a procedural oath and as a method of prosecution.

Professor Shepard's study of the political and constitutional theory of Sir John Fortescue is exceptionally timely and enlightening. Dealing with the verge of the Middle Ages, it summarizes much of the political theory and practice of the past and projects itself into the future, even to present problems of our Supreme Court. One gets a renewed sense of the importance of Fortescue's work and the lack of finality in preceding commentary. Lines of thought raised are too many even to name, but especially interesting is the discussion of how far Fortescue drew from general medieval theory and how far from specific English practice and thought.

Not wholly outside the English pale is "The Early History of Written Constitutions in America" by Professor Wright, with the written-constitution idea rooted in seventeenth century England and far beyond. This study emphasizes the often overlooked facts that judicial review was not something that sprang up suddenly in the early nineteenth century, but that it had almost as much background and was as firmly rooted as the idea of fundamental law itself. It must be mentioned as a minor point that Professor Wright appears to be committed to the old error that the charter of the Massachusetts Bay Company contained governmental provisions which "are much more extensive and specific than were those of the Virginia charters" and hence supposedly more fitted for transport and use as a frame of government in an infant colony.

Not specially connected with England or the lands related to her are the three remaining studies. Professor Lear seeks the primitive idea of *majestas* in Rome, the majesty made familiar in the treason concept of *lèse-majesté*, and presents a not wholly convincing argument for its quasi-Oriental and

religious derivation, asserting that it was never a constitutional concept until merged with *imperium* and *potestas* in a later and Christian state. In "God and the Secular Power" Dr. Baldwin analyzes medieval speculation on the divine element or sanction in various manifestations of secular power, showing how the Protestant revolution impinged on these theories, and finally how they were fitted into novel relations and conditions in new-found lands. Professor Palmer, in his "Concept of Public Opinion in Political Theory", urges that historians should furnish to political scientists and sociologists more data on the history of the subject, and he gives a specially interesting account of postwar thought on public opinion.

Any thoughtful reading of these essays emphasizes again the modernness of the past, even the remote past, and the truism that much of the alarm about change comes from the almost habitual comparison of the present with conditions immediately preceding. History of this sort gives the longer and truer view—one reason at least why history should be good for something. Perhaps sometime there may be an apparatus for diffusing these results of scholarship where they will count for more than among a handful of specialists.

The University of Minnesota. A. B. White.

The Goths in the Crimea. By Alexander Alexandrovich Vasiliev, Professor of History, University of Wisconsin. [Monographs of the Mediaeval Academy of America.] (Cambridge: the Academy. 1936. Pp. x, 292. $4.00.)

As might be expected of any work from a distinguished representative of the prewar Petersburg school of Byzantinists, Professor Vasiliev's monograph on the Goths from their earliest appearance in the Crimea to the disappearance of the eparchy of Gothia and Caffa in 1796 is a model of learning and presentation. The book has an interesting history. It results in part from the revision of two studies which appeared in Russian in the *Izvestiya Akademii Istorii Materialnoi Kultury*, I (1921), 247-344 (Mr. Vasiliev's page reference, p. vi, is incorrect) and VI (1927), 179-282. The section of the work thus published in Russian includes the first three chapters of the new monograph. The original Russian manuscript of the rest of the volume was submitted to the Academy for the History of Material Culture before Mr. Vasiliev's departure from the Soviet Union. In July, 1930, while in Leningrad, I personally requested the late N. Ya. Marr to supply either this manuscript or a copy of it to facilitate the publication of the complete monograph in English and later repeated this request (again fruitlessly) through Madame Olga Dobiash-Rozhdestvenskaya, the distinguished Leningrad palaeographer. As a result of this lack of co-operation from a group of Soviet scholars who might properly have exhibited more interest in the wider dissemination of an important product of Russian erudition, the author was

obliged to reconstruct the last four chapters of his study, which are thus the result of totally new investigation.

Vasiliev takes issue with Pallmann and Bruun by holding, on the basis of the epistle of Gregory of Neocaesarea, that the Goths in the Crimea had not been converted as early as 258, and he differs from both Latyshev and Golubinski in regarding Syrian influences in their conversion as by no means excluded. Against Harnack, Tomaschek, and others, he admits that the Gothic bishop Theophilus, who took part in the Council of Nicaea, came from the Danubian coastal area rather than from the Crimea, pointing out that in the fourth century there was but one Bishop of Bosporus, though a Gothic bishop for the Crimea was appointed by John Chrysostom about 400. Identifying Gothic territory in the fifth century as the mountainous region eastward from Balaklava to Sudak, Vasiliev does not accept the Gothic derivation of Dory-Theodoro but points to Celtic and Armenian parallels. He definitely establishes the necessity of replacing the term Tetraxite with Trapezite, which is related to the mountain Shatyr-dagh (Trapezus, Table-Mountain) behind Alushta, and thus in the Gothic *klimata*.

After an extremely clear and complete discussion of Khazan dominance in the Crimea from the late sixth to the end of the tenth century, Vasiliev effectively analyzes the so-called *Notes of a Gothic Toparch* as a source for the Gothic appeal to Svyatoslav of Kiev for help against the disorganized Khazars in 962 and its significance for Byzantine-Russian relations and discusses briefly Vladimir I's attack on Kherson in the summer of 989. As will be clear to anyone familiar with the local topography, the inlet on which Vladimir disembarked was the so-called Quarantine Bay, northeast of the Byzantine city. With reference to the little-known political history of the Crimea in the twelfth century, Vasiliev finds evidence of a temporary restoration of Byzantine authority in the title Gothicus assumed by Manuel Comnenus, though Crimean Gothia passed to the Empire of Trebizond shortly before 1200. Due attention is given to the evidence of Western travelers on the situation of Gothia during the Tartar period, and the relations of the Genoese with the Tartars through Caffa (after 1266) are treated in admirable detail. It is interesting to note that by the treaties of 1380-81 and 1387 the Tartars ceded to Genoa the whole southern Crimean coastline from Balaklava to Sudak, without including either Kherson or Kerch. Vasiliev does not admit the evidence of Rubruquis and Schiltberger as to the preservation of a Germanic dialect in Gothia as late as the beginning of the fifteenth century but considers Giosafat Barbaro's account (1436-37) as indicating that at most some individuals had not yet forgotten their native tongue, especially since no mention is made of Gothic interpreters in the *Statutum Caphe* (1449).

Between the dissolution of Tamerlane's empire and the appearance of the Ottoman Turks, Gothia again achieved independence and even menaced the Genoese coastal holdings, especially after an alliance with Venice in 1432.

Upon the Turkish capture of Constantinople, the Genoese colonies were ceded to the Banca di San Giorgio, which immediately restored friendly relations with Gothia against the common foe, before whom both Caffa and Gothia fell in 1475. The Turkish sources are evaluated by Vasiliev in dealing with these events. He is inclined to disparage the validity of Busbecq's account of survivals of Germanic linguistic remnants in the Crimea during the sixteenth century and adheres to the opinion that, though the descendants of the Goths in the Crimea retained their Orthodox faith during centuries of Tartar and Genoese domination, they were gradually Hellenized and Tartarized to the point of losing their Germanic language altogether. This attitude is perhaps somewhat radical for traditional German philologists but appears to be a thoroughly sensible one, since the Goths of the Crimea were at all times under a linguistic pressure which was likely to eliminate their native tongue there even more rapidly than in the West.

To the political and diplomatic aspects of his subject the author has added all available data on local ecclesiastical history and has thus produced a work which, though dealing with a restricted region, offers a surprisingly wide panorama of events in the Black Sea area from the later Roman period to the end of the eighteenth century. The *Goths in the Crimea* is a valuable addition to the historical literature of the Near East.

Harvard University. SAMUEL H. CROSS.

An Economic History of the British Isles. By ARTHUR BIRNIE. (New York: F. S. Crofts and Company. 1936. Pp. ix, 391. $3.00.)

THIS short economic history of the United Kingdom is distinguished by the inclusion of more material than is usual on Scotland and Ireland. There are three chapters on the history of Scotland up to 1800 and two on Ireland. There is also a short chapter on prehistoric Britain. The division of the text among the primary periods is sound, but the compass of the book is so modest that it leaves only 153 pages for a general narrative of the period since 1700. As the demands of our interests become more varied these limitations of space seem to be more serious than in the chapters dealing with the Middle Ages and the early modern period.

The book is uneven in quality. Chapters closely related to some striking special treatise are thoroughly good. If a limited number of standard works are available, the quality holds up fairly well. The chapters on early agrarian history are therefore among the best in the book. When a broad survey of a large special literature is necessary, the treatment sinks rapidly to the level of the commonplace.

The chapters on industry are poor. Old classifications of the forms of industrial enterprise are used, though the author expresses dissatisfaction with the term "domestic system". He shows no familiarity with the important work of H. D. Fong, *The Triumph of the Factory System in*

England. The term merchant-employer system, used by Fong, will certainly dominate the literature of the future, and it is a pity not to contribute something to the generalization of a truly felicitous term. There is little justification today for the use of the concepts of machine and tool popularized by Marx and Ure. Furthermore, with all due regard to the importance of commercial expansion, it is now a gross overstatement to say that commercial expansion was the primary cause of the "industrial revolution". The introduction of machinery was not merely a "reaction" to new demands but a positive and independent achievement. Even if one feels little interest in technology, a sound knowledge of economic geography and of the principles of the location of economic activity should lead to a better appreciation of the significance of technology. These portions of the text merely reflect the older literature of the subject. Even within these limitations of space it might have been possible to pay some attention to the advance of thought.

Harvard University. ABBOTT PAYSON USHER.

Roman Britain and the English Settlements. By R. G. COLLINGWOOD and J. N. L. MYRES. [The Oxford History of England.] (New York: Oxford University Press. 1936; second edition, 1937. Pp. 515. $5.00.)

THE fact that in less than a year a second edition of this volume, chronologically the first of the fourteen of The Oxford History of England, has appeared, with various minor corrections, speaks at once for the interest of its subject and for the value of its contents. In the space at our disposal it is impossible even to summarize the work, which closes with a valuable *bibliographie raisonnée*, much less to give it the detailed consideration which it merits in view of the importance of its statements, supported by careful citation of evidence or cautiously presented as merely tentative because of paucity of data. It seems best, then, to call attention to certain conclusions of the authors which appear to be of particular interest.

In the first place, one must note the nature of the evidence for this entire period. Of written documents for the Romano-British age we have relatively little, since Britain lay too far outside the major interests of the Empire to evoke the wealth of material which we possess for other areas; and for the century of the English settlements (*ca.* 450-550) we have almost nothing, so that the story must be pieced together from inscriptions and coins, from place names, and from archaeological evidence. The Roman invasion, we are told, was primarily to protect possession of Gaul; and Hadrian's Wall was built to mark the northern limit of proposed conquest, the Wall itself serving as a patrol for some 5000 men, the Vallum controlling traffic and customs, and the Stanegate probably representing the *limes* built in Trajan's reign after the evacuation of Scotland. The much lighter Antonine Wall, on the other hand, was designed merely to relieve Hadrian's Wall of threats from Lowland tribes.

One of the great differences between Britain and the rest of the Roman Empire was that the former tended toward village and country life, while the latter was predominantly urban. The cities in Britain, centers of Romanization, had an average population of between one and two thousand, London itself having scarcely over 1500, and the population of the entire island being perhaps a million, of whom half were more or less Romanized. The countryfolk were at best only half Romanized; the peasantry remained Celtic. In the country, again, one must distinguish between the Roman villas, essentially self-contained and cultivated under the direction of their masters, and the British villages, where each peasant had his own small field under some sort of individual tenure. In the third century the cities increasingly declined; and in the end the villa triumphed over city and village alike. Hadrian's Wall was abandoned at the death of Gratian in 383; and the close of Roman rule, the date of which is determined by the new office of *Comes Britanniarum*, began about 417 and ended some years after 429. The decline after the departure of the Romans was gradual, due largely to loss of initiative in local government, though for a time this was checked by Vortigern, whose invitation to Hengist and Horsa was but a revival of the Roman method of creating a new settlement of *foederati* in the land. Arthur is interpreted as a commander of mobile, mail-clad cavalry, not as a king.

The traditional triad of Teutonic invaders—Angles, Saxons, and Jutes—were already mixed on the Continent, and the *Adventus Saxonum* took place within ten years of the middle of the fifth century. The civilization of the conquerors of Kent was partly Frisian, partly Frankish from the Middle Rhine, but totally unlike that of Jutland. In the early years of the sixth century the Kentishmen occupied southern Hants and the Isle of Wight, the Saxons having landed almost directly south of Chichester in 477. Before the end of the fifth century, settlement of the lands radiating from the Fens (then far more habitable than later in this period) was well advanced by invaders from the estuary of the Wash. The East Anglians were a federation of small tribes who had percolated into the area from at least five directions; the Mercians came by the Icknield Way; and settlers of the Upper Thames valley formed the nucleus of Wessex. In the north were the Humbrenses, who, by the beginning of the fifth century, entered by the Humber between Lindsey and Deira, spreading south into Mercia, pressing north of York, and invading Bernicia by the Tyne estuary and the coast between the Tweed and the Coquet.

Columbia University. LOUIS H. GRAY.

Pembroke College, Cambridge: A Short History. By AUBREY ATTWATER. Edited with an Introduction and a Postscript by S. C. Roberts. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1936. Pp. viii, 129. $1.75.)

WITHOUT specific references to sources and with few footnotes, this

historiola disarms criticism because it is a brief summary of what was to be a definitive history of the College of Valence-Marie, undertaken at the urgent behest of the author's friends at Pembroke and published posthumously. Unassuming but apparently thorough scholarship as well as personal devotion have produced a narrative largely of external events but informative, human, and replete with suggestive anecdotes.

Chapter I deals with the founding and endowing by Mary, countess of Pembroke, daughter of Guy de St. Pol and Mary of Brittany, and widow of Aymer de Valence, of "the hall or house of Valence-Marie" (p. 10). Two sets of statutes still in the college treasury, each purporting to be the work of the foundress in 1347, present a problem. The earlier provides for two rectors to have external control, as at the Parisian colleges, while the later establishes the characteristically English method of "an endowed self-governing body subject only to limited interference by an external Visitor" (p. 9), an invention usually attributed to William de Merton. Chapters II to VI give a chronological survey of the mastership. But they provide no dull, meticulous account thereof.

Before about 1550 the only source is certain extracts made by Matthew Wren in the seventeenth century from two account books "missing ever since" (p. 15). Then appear the audit book and treasury accounts, also used by Wren, "a genuine antiquary, filled with a love of the history and traditions of the College" (p. 65). His labors, continued through the latter eighteenth century, were expanded and augmented in the mid-nineteenth.

The New Learning touched the college lightly, while religious revolutions in the sixteenth century literally swept through its halls. That Pembroke was a "collegium episcopale" up to 1675 is amply substantiated. Neither Commonwealth nor Restoration produced considerable changes, and the shape assumed in the latter seventeenth century persisted till mid-nineteenth century, when the modern period of extensive building began. Since 1870 it has gradually become one of the larger colleges.

Distinguished graduates like Ridley, Spenser, Crashaw, and the younger Pitt require brief notice—all that Attwater gives them—but for the extensive though diverting account of Gabriel Harvey's controversies with other fellows might have been substituted the few brief references in his Letter Book to the officially unnoticed custom of reading history. The treatment of benefactions, of the rise and fall of admissions, and of physical growth is adequate, but the reference to a "more than mathematic gloom" (p. 94), from which in 1746 curricular changes with a humanistic bias relieved the college, leaves students of education curious and dissatisfied. Humorous anecdotes are frequently tucked away among serious expositions. The World War and recent deaths have taken heavy toll, but "the House of Valence Marie goes on" (p. 122).

Marietta College. WILLIAM C. GERRISH.

Histoire de l'Orléanais. Par R. Crozet. [Les vieilles provinces de France.] (Paris: Boivin. 1936. Pp. 327. 20 fr.)

This volume of French provincial history contains excellent chapters on the later Middle Ages, with special emphasis upon cultural history. The seventy-five pages devoted to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, "deux siècles de centralisation administrative, de conformisme religieux et de conservatisme politique et social", are among the best in the book. The author has stressed geographic factors intelligently, has given convincing pictures of the economic life of the Loire valley at different periods, and has paid more attention to the intellectual and artistic life of the province than is usual in books of this type. But though informed, the book is tedious; adequate, it is nonetheless uninspired. Even the best paragraphs are too long, too nearly catalogues of fact and overburdened with too many names. The early chapters, concerned with Roman, Frank, and Norman, are mediocre. The feudal chapters, veritable mazes of detail, are distinctly poor. The last two chapters, dealing with the nineteenth century, are weak. The selection of illustrations is good but not as good as the readers of this series have been led to expect. There are two sketch maps, both helpful though hardly entirely clear. There is no bibliography, not even a bibliographical note.

The author gives the impression at the close that he could have written a far better book. He there discusses the temporary and the permanent elements in the history of his province and brings out very clearly, though perhaps unwittingly, the extraordinary vigor of the provincial tradition in French history. He admits the fatal weakness of the non-achievement of provincial unity in the feudal period, the too great preponderance of the cities of Orléans, Chartres, and Blois in the whole history of the province, the dangerous proximity of the Capetian, and the inevitable but too complete submission to the Bourbon. Yet, he says, the Beauce and the Sologne remain, with the Loire between. Moreover, *le paysage humain* likewise remains. No administrative reform will ever abolish the beauty of the towns and villages of the Loire, for there is only one Loire in France, and it possesses unique gifts. Furthermore, no province is dead, even though it is cut up into departments, when it contains the cathedral of Chartres and the château of Chambord. The reader may justly conclude that although there are provinces in France which explain their persistent vitality by frontier positions, geographic compulsions, or economic peculiarities, the Orléanais is not to be counted among their number. The author would have done well to have pointed out that the whole history of the Orléanais thus bears witness with even greater force to the reality of the regional factor in French history of which every province is an example.

Smith College. Sidney R. Packard.

Old Wires and New Waves: The History of the Telegraph, Telephone, and Wireless. By ALVIN F. HARLOW. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 1936. Pp. xiv, 548. $5.00.)

PRIOR to the publication of this book a synthetic story of the telegraph, the telephone, and wireless and their relation to modern civilization was lacking. Those who have concerned themselves with the problem of communications have been interested primarily in transportation. The literature dealing with canals, railroads, and improved highways, for example, is voluminous in comparison with that devoted to the telegraph, telephone, and wireless. As the author of *Old Towpaths: The Story of the American Canal Era, Old Postbags: The Story of the Mail Service,* and *Old Waybills: The Romance of the Express Companies,* the writer of the volume under review has himself been a contributor to the history of the more glamorous aspects of American transportation.

Old Wires and New Waves contains twenty-five chapters of about equal length. The first three chronicle the story of man's desire for quick communication and the means employed to effect it from the days of the ancients to the opening of the nineteenth century. Though at times a bit monotonous because of the wealth of detail presented, they constitute a fitting introduction to what follows. Chapters IV to XVI are concerned with the electric telegraph—including Morse's claims, the age of telegraphic competition and litigation, the rise of the Associated Press, the laying of the ocean cables, the telegraph and the Civil War, the trend toward monopoly, and the fight for a government telegraph. Chapters XVII to XIX discuss the telephone and the triumph of the Bell patent. Chapters XX and XXI trace the story of the financial buccaneering in the realm of communications and the emergence of the rival Western Union and International Telegraph and Telephone companies. Chapters XXII and XXIII give a somewhat brief sketch of wireless, while the last two chapters attempt to aid the reader to appreciate the importance of the telegraph, telephone, and wireless in shaping modern civilization. More than seventy cuts, facsimiles, posters, and diagrams illustrate the text.

Such a description of content fails to indicate the merit of this volume or to show the extent to which the telegraph, the telephone, and wireless have helped to undermine our old community life and to destroy our local economy. They have, as the author shows, made us increasingly puppets of "a great central government, great newspaper chains, great propaganda agencies which shape minds to wire and air, cramming them into narrow mass produced molds" (p. 117). Nor does any brief enumeration of chapter content portray the play of human factors depicted in this book.

Materials for the volume were gathered from a wide variety of sources. In addition to manuscript collections, including that of Henry O'Reilly, the

voluminous newspaper, magazine, and pamphlet literature has been carefully sifted and handled with sympathy and understanding. As in the case of the reaper and other inventions relating to a number of American industries, long-drawn-out litigation involving patent rights marked the history of the development of communication in the United States, and Dr. Harlow has been at pains to delve into the more important of these legal battles. Nor has he neglected the great mass of personal correspondence, including that of Peter Cooper and Abram S. Hewitt, regarding the Atlantic cable and the American Telegraph Company.

The author does not profess to have said the final word. What he has done is to blaze a synthetic trail through a mass of intricate detail. This volume deserves to be widely read, and it is certain to be of service to all those who are interested in this subject.

Columbia University. HARRY J. CARMAN.

Vita di avventure, di fede, e di passione. By BENEDETTO CROCE. [Scritti di storia letteraria, e politica.] (Bari: Gius. Laterza & figli. 1936. Pp. viii, 446. 35 l.)

THE most erudite Italian since Muratori and the greatest Italian philosopher since Vico has brought together in this handsome volume six biographical studies of absorbing interest, which bear the imprint of his knowledge of minute detail, his critical acumen, and his literary gifts. These "lives of adventure, of faith, and of passion" succeed admirably in showing how romantic careers can be treated historically and vividly without resorting to the irresponsible and deplorable methods of "romanticized biographies". It is scarcely possible to discuss in the space of a brief review Croce's extensive researches in Italian, Swiss, and French archives, his familiarity with obscure writings, and the varied incidents, problems, and situations which he recalls, covering different periods from the late thirteenth to the early nineteenth century and involving genealogical details, feudal and dynastic struggles, the temper of *condottieri,* the historicity of chronicles, the faith of a religious convert, the literary work and tragic life of a poetess, *crimes passionels,* and the revolutionary ferment in Italy. All the biographies before us are connected, for the most part, with the history of southern Italy to which Croce has already made learned and illuminating contributions.

The first study concerns Philip of Flanders, the fifth son of Guy of Dampierre. As a beneficiary of Charles of Anjou, Philip spent much of his time amid his feudal domains in southern Italy, including the prosperous center of Lanciano, until he decided, at the cost of his domains, to assist the cause of his family and his Flemish compatriots against Philip the Fair of France in 1303. After enjoying considerable power in Flanders, where he championed democratic and even demagogic policies which contrasted with

his brutal and arrogant treatment of some of his Italian subjects, he returned to Italy, passing his last years in straitened circumstances.

The second study deals with the vicissitudes of the fifteenth century Italian *condottiere,* Cola di Monforte, count of Campobasso, whose name has been maligned by historians, dramatists, and novelists (notably Sir Walter Scott) as the symbol of a consummate traitor, a veritable Ganelon and Iago. Such an infamous reputation is based principally, if not solely, on the account of Campobasso in Commynes's *Mémoires.* We are told about Cola's family and youth, his military support of the Angevin cause in the kingdom of Naples and in Catalonia, his conspicuous role in aiding Charles the Bold, duke of Burgundy, in his unsuccessful struggle with Louis XI, and his employment by Venice. Croce is the first historian to give a searching and dispassionate analysis of Cola's alleged betrayal of Charles the Bold at Nancy and a telling refutation of Commynes's charges. The pages devoted to Cola's relations with Charles and to Commynes constitute a model of method and presentation for those interested in the growth of historical legends. The biography of Cola is complemented by a short appendix which throws much new light on the life of Angelo Cato, the archbishop of Vienne, who inspired Commynes to write his *Mémoires.*

Forming the subject of Croce's third study is the conversion to Calvinism of a Neapolitan nobleman, Galeazzo Caracciolo (1517-86), son and heir of the marchese di Vico, who heroically dissociated himself from his father, wife, and children, and from the splendor of his surroundings in order to practice the new faith at Geneva, where he established close contacts with Calvin and attained a leading position in the Italian Calvinist community. Caracciolo's firm devotion to the call of his conscience, despite strong pleas urging his return to the religion of his fathers, the contrast between puritanical Geneva and festive Naples—then the second most populous city in Europe—the characteristic features of Calvinist theology, the circumstances under which the Italian was granted a divorce because of his wife's refusal to join him, and the relations of Italians to the reform movement, receive masterly treatment. Although Croce had no reason to mention the fact, it may be noted here that the first translation of an Italian author to appear in this country was *The Italian Convert: News from Italy of a Second Moses, or the Life of Galeacius Caracciolus . . . containing the Story of his Admirable Conversion from Popery,* etc., by Niccolò Balbani (Boston, 1751).

Isabella Di Morra and Diego Sandoval De Castro, both sixteenth century poets, are the subjects of the fourth study. While her father was an exile in France, Isabella lived a lonely existence with her mother and brothers at Favale in Basilicata. Her exchange of letters and verses with her neighbor De Castro so infuriated her brothers that they murdered the suspected lovers as well as the messenger of the correspondence.

The fifth study is devoted to the romantic experiences of the Spaniard

Diego Dugue De Estrada (*ca.* 1593-1649), who lived many years in Italy, and whose autobiographical *Comentarios* are stripped of much of their glamor and authenticity by Croce's array of reliable documents. Although he impugns the historical accuracy of the *Comentarios,* Croce recognizes the value of the work in revealing its author's psychology and the customs and habits of thought of his time.

The sixth and final study describes the career of the Neapolitan conspirator, revolutionist, and ardent champion of Italian unity, Carlo Lauberg (1762-1834), a descendant of a family of Walloon origin which had been in the service of the kings of Naples. Instead of pursuing a military career, he became a monk and a teacher, with a deep interest in philosophy, mathematics, and chemistry, eventually giving up his ecclesiastical garb and devoting himself assiduously, as an organizer, orator, journalist, and anticlerical polemicist, to the propagation of French revolutionary doctrines on behalf of Italian freedom. He was president of the provisional government of the Neapolitan republic in 1799, after which he served as a pharmacist in the French army (being the chief pharmacist of the Grand Army during the Russian campaign) and then went into retirement, anxious, above all, to hide his revolutionary past.

To those accustomed to think of Croce as essentially a speculative thinker, this volume, his thirtieth on literary and political history, should serve as a reminder of his vast erudition. His own personality is incomprehensible unless it is borne in mind that, besides being a great philosopher, he is a historian of the first order.

Harvard University. GAUDENS MEGARO.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

The Medieval English Borough: Studies on its Origins and Constitutional History. By JAMES TAIT. [Publications of the University of Manchester.] (Manchester: University Press. 1936. Pp. xx, 371. 17*s.* 6*d.*)

THIS book is the culmination of studies that have largely occupied Mr. Tait's attention since, over fifteen years ago, he undertook the editorship of Adolphus Ballard's unfinished *British Borough Charters.* The second volume of that compilation appeared in 1923, and in the next few years Mr. Tait published the essays which, with some revision, now constitute his chapters VII-XI. In 1930, as he states in his preface, his plans for continuing the work he had begun were disturbed by an article of mine ("The Anglo-Saxon Borough", *Eng. Hist. Rev.,* XLV, 177; incorporated with many changes in *Borough and Town,* 1933), which led him to extend his researches into the years before 1066 and eventually to write the six chapters that now discuss the origin of the borough in the Anglo-Saxon period.

Mr. Tait's book, accordingly, is not a monograph on the medieval Eng-

lish borough, but a collection of essays grouped under two heads. The group on the Anglo-Saxon period, now first published, are well co-ordinated and present a fairly complete picture. The group on the later period remain much as they were originally written and, despite the addition of various postscripts, are neither unified nor comprehensive. This, in many ways, is a pity, for we need a well-rounded sketch of English municipal development in the later Middle Ages, and Mr. Tait's knowledge of the pertinent sources is unequaled—a fact borne out by the present volume. Although Mr. Tait has not attempted to describe the borough constitution as a whole, he has assembled and analyzed materials on many of its important phases, especially finance, magistrates, councils, and the gradual emergence of corporate organization.

Readers of this journal may remember that, while writing *Borough and Town*, I was led to criticize some of Mr. Tait's conclusions (XXXVII, 451 f.). He had, it seemed to me, failed to take into account the more recent work on Continental towns and, in particular, had overestimated the influence of the revolutionary French commune in England. Some of these criticisms Mr. Tait now meets with a series of notes and appendixes, to which, without prolongation of minor disputes, the interested reader is directly referred (see pp. 217 f., 248 f., 296 f.).

A more important point is the synthesis presented by Mr. Tait's first six chapters—the portion of the book which, according to his preface, he now offers in answer to certain arguments of mine. Here again it will be unnecessary to go into minute detail. But no adequate notice of Mr. Tait's work can be given without considering his principal thesis and frankly stating its relation to my own. In 1926 I wrote a brief paper (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXII, 10 f.) to suggest that Pirenne's theory of urban origins on the Continent might be applied also to the English boroughs. This idea was further developed in my article of 1930 and still further in *Borough and Town*. Up to that time Mr. Tait had shown no great interest in the question of the primitive borough. After criticizing Maitland's garrison theory in 1897 (*Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XII, 772 f.), he had at most given the subject a passing glance in the course of other book reviews. Accordingly, on trying to discover what theory Mr. Tait preferred to that of Maitland, I could only guess that he remained attached to the school of Maurer, Below, and Stubbs, who had explained the town as a mere outgrowth of the *Landgemeinde* or self-governing village. Mr. Tait had assuredly had many opportunities to express dissent from the ruling doctrine and had expressed none. When he devoted nearly six pages to a review of *Borough and Town* (*ibid.*, XLVIII, 642-48), he gave no hint of enthusiasm for its "revolutionary" thesis. And now, although chapters I-VI of *The Medieval English Borough* often cite Stephensonian opinions, the purpose of the citation is almost invariably to set up a target.

It is therefore rather surprising to find Mr. Tait's book and mine so little

divergent on fundamentals. They agree, for example, that the word *burh* originally had no urban significance and could be applied to all fortifications, including Roman cities; that in the latter, after the Saxon occupation, life was mainly agricultural, although some trade survived in and about the ancient market places; that the new boroughs of the Danish wars were essentially military constructions, only a minority of which attracted permanent settlements; that, after the conquest of the Danelaw, "the defensive aspect became secondary and the borough a centre of local trade and administration" (p. 65); that such a borough was usually called a port because, like an ancient Roman city, it included a market and a mint; that it did not of necessity have a court of its own, much less a truly urban court; that in this connection Liebermann's translations of the dooms are generally misleading; that Domesday Book shows the boroughs, for judicial and other purposes, still incorporated in a system of territorial hundreds; consequently, that the borough, as a privileged community, was a comparatively late development gradually produced by a revival of trade beginning in the tenth century.

There are, of course, many points of difference between the two books. Mr. Tait is very reluctant to admit the parallel between borough-construction in England and burg-construction in contemporary Flanders or Germany. The English boroughs, he says (pp. 5, 21), were "usually much larger". Yet, so long as the original size of most boroughs remains undetermined, it is impossible to know that. Mr. Tait also stresses the absence of feudalism as differentiating the royal boroughs of England from the "feudal" burgs of Flanders. But why should the fortress or administrative center of a count necessarily differ from that of a king? Without definition of terms the argument is meaningless.

Where the books chiefly disagree, however, is in estimating the amount of mercantile life and communal privilege that had appeared in England before 1066. Domesday proves that a number of boroughs, especially the ports of the southern and eastern coasts, were already enjoying a certain degree of municipal liberty under Edward the Confessor. The author of the tract called *Episcopus* might well at that time contrast borough-right with land-right—in some localities. In those localities, too, it is not unlikely that burgage tenure had already come into existence. The problem is the extent to which such custom prevailed among the Anglo-Saxon boroughs. From the scanty evidence of the dooms Mr. Tait argues that the official borough of the tenth century, because it contained a market, tended to be dominated by mercantile life. But when markets were not restricted to boroughs, why should we suppose a borough market to have been more urban than the contemporary borough court?

Mr. Tait presents a stronger argument to show that I have exaggerated the effect of the Norman Conquest on English towns by over-rating their

agricultural character before 1066. Space is lacking in this brief review for adequate discussion of his long and careful re-examination of the Domesday evidence. Mr. Tait may be right in some cases; as he keeps reminding me, I have changed my mind before. Here again, however, the dispute becomes one of how much and how many. The few boroughs in which Domesday proves the existence of communal privilege under Edward the Confessor have to me seemed exceptional. Mr. Tait considers them quite typical and so is bound to read the *burgus* and *burgensis* of Domesday as technical terms and to find burgage tenure in a great variety of references to customs of boroughs or burgesses.

Personally, I remain unconvinced, but shall postpone fuller criticism to a more opportune occasion. For the moment I shall only point out that, after all, the question whether most boroughs had or had not become trading communities by 1066 is of minor significance to the thesis which I have sought to advance. Mr. Tait has indicated a number of errors in my book. He has rightly emphasized various points that I neglected. He has perhaps convicted me of other faults. Yet is it not clear that Mr. Tait, for all his reticence in the matter, now takes his place among converts to the mercantile-settlement theory of urban origins?

Cornell University. CARL STEPHENSON.

The Chronicle of Melrose, from the Cottonian Manuscript, Faustina B. IX in the British Museum: A Complete and Full-size Facsimile in Collotype. With an Introduction by ALAN ORR ANDERSON and MARJORIE OGILVIE ANDERSON, and an Index by William Croft Dickinson. [No. 100 in the Series of Monographs by writers connected with the London School of Economics and Political Science.] (London: Percy Lund Humphries and Company. 1936. Pp. lxxxii, 264. £5 15*s.* 6*d.*)

THIS is a strange but beautiful and useful book. The *Chronicle of Melrose* is "the principal monastic chronicle of Scotland", and it has survived "in the original manuscript in which it was written, or copied from successive editors' drafts". The two existing editions of the chronicle are "mischievously inaccurate", containing "innumerable misreadings", and the English translation is "unsatisfactory and in many places glaringly incorrect". What would seem to be our primary need, therefore, is a scholarly new printed edition, large enough to meet the demands of those who need to use it and published at a price within their reach. But instead of this we have a magnificent full-size facsimile reproduction of the manuscript, published in an edition of 225 numbered copies at an almost prohibitive price.

Nevertheless, in spite of these conspicuous disadvantages, much has been done to make the book in some degree serviceable in lieu of a definitive printed edition. The introduction, dealing to some extent at least with the sources of the chronicle, will lift a heavy burden from any future editor; and

there are pages of transcriptions of "additions" to the text—marginalia for the most part, which are difficult to read—so that, since the main body of the text is manageable for a person of only limited palaeographical experience, the chronicle can now be used with fair facility by almost anyone, at least as a check on the inaccurate old editions. Finally, an index of 115 pages, folio be it noted, is provided, which is complete for persons and places and also includes a good number of subject headings. Thus a student who wishes to know what there is in this source concerning a particular subject in which he may be interested need not work his way through 148 folio pages of medieval writing: he can as a rule turn to the index and there find a complete summary, in English, of the whole matter with detailed references to every item.

However, the avowed intention of the editors has not been to provide a substitute for a printed edition but rather to make a contribution to Scottish palaeography, and they offer their facsimile "as an instructive example of the manner in which a monastic chronicle was composed". In point of fact not all monastic chronicles were composed in the same way, but it is only fair to say that the editors have indulged very little in theory or speculation and have confined themselves closely to the matter before them. Dividing the manuscript into sections, "of which it can usually be said that each was written either by one hand, or by different hands with similar training", they have given a detailed descriptive analysis of each. This is preliminary spadework towards some possible future history of Scottish schools of writing. More than this it is not, nor does it claim to be.

Bryn Mawr College. C. W. David.

Medieval Oxford. By the Reverend H. E. Salter. [Oxford Historical Society.] (New York: Oxford University Press. 1936. Pp. 160. $3.00.)

This unpretentious little book contains the Ford Lectures delivered by a distinguished scholar steeped in knowledge of Oxford. The list of the annual publications of the Oxford Historical Society since 1906 shows that Dr. Salter, its honorary secretary, has edited more than half of them—cartularies, university archives, city muniments. He is therefore admirably equipped for writing these six lectures on Saxon, Domesday, and medieval Oxford, the university and the churches, and for discussing fascinating details of the early geography, the puzzling boundary on the north side, the "substantial structure" of the Grandpont, built in the eleventh century by Robert d'Oilli. Is it possible that when at Easter, 1398, the king's bench went to Grandpont, it sat in d'Oilli's "fortified gateway"? The description of the localities would, however, be far more effective were the volume supplied with adequate maps.

In his brief sketch of government Dr. Salter touches on an age-old controversy by identifying the members of the gild merchant with the "citizens", or "burgesses", or "freemen" (p. 35). His dogmatic statements

differ, on the one hand, from Professor Tait's cautious words, "They act, in fact, as one body with two aspects, not as two which were merely in large part composed of the same persons", and on the other, from Professor Stephenson's recent assertion that since Gross's arguments "no further attempt has been made to identify gild and borough". The subject is indeed difficult; but Dr. Salter has not, I think, proved that the "extranei in gilda mercatoria" were actually "foreign burgesses" (p. 44).

Judicial matters have scarcely received due attention. Thus, except for one incidental reference (pp. 71-2) not included in the woefully meager index, there is no mention of the justices of the peace. Yet between 1364 and 1397, as Dr. E. G. Kimball informs me, nine commissions of the peace were issued for the city as distinct from the county.

The information on the colleges and halls of the university and on the numbers and mode of life of masters and students is exceedingly valuable; but Dr. Salter's suggestion that because many legal handbooks were drawn up in Oxford, common law must have been studied there (p. 95, n. 1) is not convincing. The multiplicity of such manuals produced in many other places implies that they were meant for the practical needs of busy clerks and lawyers. Perhaps the most important comment on the university is the statement that the influence of "Wycliffism" in Oxford has been overestimated and that it had practically disappeared by 1420.

In concluding this short notice of a delightful volume, it seems fitting to emphasize the invaluable character of the work of the Oxford Historical Society, now sadly hampered for lack of funds, and to echo the hope expressed by the keeper of the University archives that it may find renewed support from those who care for the university and its famous city.

Mount Holyoke College. B. H. Putnam.

Die Juden im christlichen Spanien. Von Fritz Baer. Erster Teil, *Urkunden und Regesten.* Zweiter Band, *Kastilien, Inquisitionsakten.* (Berlin: Schocken Verlag. 1936. Pp. xv, 596.)

This long-expected second volume continues the publication of Professor Baer's important work, the first volume of which, devoted to the history of the Jews in medieval Aragon and Navarre, appeared in 1929. It is to be hoped that the third volume, on the controversial religious literature, and the fourth, which is to contain a systematic treatment of the history of the Jews in Christian Spain on the basis of the documents assembled in the first three volumes, will be published in more rapid succession. In the meantime the author's views on certain important phases of Spanish-Jewish history can only be gleaned from incidental remarks in the notes to the respective documents and from various encyclopedia articles and monographic studies published by him in scholarly journals. Of special significance is his programmatic essay, "Probleme der spanisch-jüdischen Geschichte" in the *Korrespon-*

denzblatt of the Berlin Jewish Academy, VI (1925), 5-25, which may also serve as a good general introduction to the present volume.

While a more definitive evaluation of the material here assembled will have to await the completion of the entire work, students of medieval history will be grateful to the author for having made available a number of hitherto unpublished documents, re-edited a number of others on the basis of more reliable manuscripts, and summarized from widely scattered and frequently inaccessible publications practically all the sources hitherto known. The form of *Regesta* in chronological order has been chosen to include these diverse sources. Owing to the unsatisfactory state of preservation of the notarial and royal chancery archives in Castile, this volume contains less unpublished material than did the first. Only the sources pertaining to the Inquisition (pp. 437-545) are extracted from the unpublished records of the inquisitorial courts in Toledo, Valencia, Saragossa, and Huesca and from the Llorente collection in Paris. Of special interest is the prosecution of a number of professing Jews in Huesca in 1489-1490 because of their alleged missionary activity among Christians and backsliding converts (pp. 484-509).

The bulk of the work is devoted to the history of the Jews in Castile from 900 to 1499. The increasing difficulties of the Jewish position in Spain which led to the "holy war" of 1391, the subsequent anti-Jewish legislation, and the serious complications emanating from the socio-religious interrelations between the large and influential body of *conversos* and the professing Jews are treated in greater detail than the preceding periods. A number of previously unpublished documents (nos. 247 ff.) throw new light on the tragic events of 1390-1392.

Numerous new sources help to clarify the contradictory aspects of the legal status of the Jews, who, in some cases (nos. 22, 30, etc.) appear as in possession of equal rights with the Christian burghers, while in others (no. 60, art. 107, etc.) they figure as "serfs" of the king. We have examples of transfers of the income from Jewish taxation to local grandees (no. 140), but we also perceive ever more clearly the primary allegiance of the Jews to the royal power. In the thirteenth century *fuero* of Salamanca, for example, the Jews are specifically placed under the protection of the city council. The law emphasizes, nevertheless, that the Jews "non ayan otro senor se non el rey" (no. 57).

Medieval Jewish moneylending appears under somewhat new aspects in the light of the decisions of a court of arbitration elected by the city and the Jewish community of Ocaña in 1327 (no. 151) and the royal decree, issued at the instance of the Christian population of the bishopric of Osma in 1483, forbidding the interference of the ecclesiastical courts in lawsuits between Jewish creditors and Christian debtors (no. 339). The operation of Jewish self-governmental agencies is illustrated by such newly available sources as those pertaining to the endowment of a Jewish school in Ecija in 1332 (no.

157) and the conflict in the royal appointment of the chief rabbi of Castilian Jewry in 1476 (no. 329). The reader will also welcome the much better texts of nos. 96 and 287, containing a detailed list of taxes imposed upon the respective Castilian communities in 1290 and the decisions of the Jewish synod of Valladolid in 1432. It is to be regretted that the author has refrained from annotating more extensively the latter document, written in a curious mixture of Hebrew and Judeo-Spanish (in Hebrew characters). These few examples may give an inkling of the wealth of the material included in this carefully edited, reliably annotated, and bibliographically rich volume.

Unfortunately limitations of space forced the author to reduce the index of place names and subjects to a few pages, with the resulting crowding of some forty to eighty page references under such important entries as "Toledo", "Abgaben", "Cortes", "Mauren", etc. The bibliography is replaced by an index of authors. Even the relatively fullest index, that of persons, divided into three groups of Jews, Christians, and *conversos* (pp. 547-81), includes but a small part of the large collection of names of medieval Spanish Jews assembled by the author (p. x). Of course, these minor flaws do not reflect in the slightest upon the significance of this monumental work, which, when completed, will serve as an indispensable guide through the fascinating, though often perplexing, history of the Jews in Christian Spain.

Columbia University. SALO W. BARON.

The Allegory of Love: A Study in Medieval Tradition. By C. S. LEWIS, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1936. Pp. viii, 378. $5.00.)

THIS is a distinguished book, notable for depth of scholarship apparent on every page, wise erudition in criticism, and delightful felicity of style. To propound theories and venture interpretations of medieval allegorical literature is difficult in an age which has grown so far away from allegory; nevertheless the author has achieved a success deserving of high praise, and his book should be read from cover to cover. The volume is one that would be interesting primarily to students of literary criticism, yet it contains so much that is pertinent for all concerned with the cultural and social history of the Middle Ages that historians cannot afford to let it pass unnoticed. The introductory chapter on "Courtly Love" should prove an antidote to some of the inanities so frequently encountered in discussions of this perplexing phenomenon and may well be read to supplement sections of Professor Christopher Dawson's valuable *Medieval Religion and Other Essays*. In tracing the rise of the sentiment called courtly love Lewis gives Ovid his due but leans heavily upon the formula "Ovid misunderstood" as the real key to the secret of classical influence. Provençal forces were, of course, important, but it is with Chrétien de Troyes that "we see the developed theory of love put into action in the course of stories", and in the thirteenth century Andreas

Capellanus contributed a theoretical work on the new ideal by writing his *De arte honeste amandi*. A lengthy chapter treats of the history and nature of allegory from classical times to the thirteenth century, emphasizing in particular the influence of Statius in the *Thebaid* for the earlier period and that of the school of Chartres for the twelfth century. The impress of this school can be traced on almost every page of allegorical love poetry written in the following century.

The Romance of the Rose is discussed in a chapter rich in interesting comment which should send some to read this often quoted but little read classic of the Middle Ages. The remaining four chapters consider Chaucer, Gower and Thomas Usk, allegory as the dominant form, and *The Faerie Queene*. These titles fall short of describing the real content of the chapters, for the author does not restrict himself exclusively to a consideration of things English but, mindful of his theme, includes all that belongs in his field. His way to Spenser is not from *The Romance of the Rose* through English allegory but by way of the Italian epic of the sixteenth century. No reader need fear being lost in the airy realm of allegory with Lewis as a guide, for he is as sane as he is sure, and very human. Conscious of the fact that he often writes of things obscure, the author does not hesitate to eschew profundity when the obvious forces itself upon him, and one may encounter in the same paragraph (p. 307) characters out of Boiardo and Ariosto, Spenser's Maleger, Baron Munchausen, and—of all companions—Mickey Mouse!

Princeton University. GRAY C. BOYCE.

The Amazing Frederic. By GERTRUDE SLAUGHTER. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1937. Pp. xi, 397. $3.75.)

MRS. Slaughter's book on Frederick II should give to many who, without being students of the Middle Ages, have an interest in the men and the intellectual life of that period, a feeling of personal acquaintance and sympathy with one of the most elusive and interesting figures of the thirteenth century. The enthusiasm of the writer for her hero and her conviction of her true understanding of him give the picture clarity and force. The reader is made to feel the man's power, his personal charm, above all his extraordinarily keen intellectual interests and abilities. Frederick is undoubtedly heroized, and it is difficult to distinguish between his biographer's interpretation of his policies and character and the evidence that she draws from what appears to be a wide reading of contemporary accounts. This difficulty is in part due to the omission of notes of reference—an omission that is in accordance with the present style in popular biographical writing. That Mrs. Slaughter comes to her subject without long study of the period and of the controversial matters with which she deals gives her a certain directness of

approach that has its advantage for the casual reader. For students of the period, however, the judgment of the actions and policies of Frederick and of his opponents, the popes and the Lombard cities, is open to criticism. She writes: "The man who was the first monarch in Europe to give his people a constitution, to call the third estate to parliament and to combat feudalism is not to be judged an 'oriental despot' by one chance phrase. His true ideal, which constant warfare almost destroyed, was 'equal justice for all' ". The constitutions he gave his people were modeled on the constitutions of the Roman emperors, expressive of the absolutism of the prince, the source of law; the so-called parliament was an assembly called to hear and minister to his will; feudalism was a condition that must be combatted by anyone who aimed at autocracy. It is doubtless this same view of Frederick as an initiator of constitutional monarchy that leads his biographer to see in the opposition of the Lombard cities only obstinate lawlessness. "They did not stop to think that he was working to satisfy their own desire for civil liberties and some means of escape from the hampering control of rich and powerful bishops." Surely this is a misunderstanding at once of the Lombard cities in the thirteenth century and of Frederick's attitude towards civil liberties. For the aims and actions of the popes, the great Innocent III and the later implacable foes of the emperor's ambitions, Mrs. Slaughter has utter condemnation. In dealing with Frederick's position towards religion she most judiciously avoids on the one hand mistaking for personal orthodoxy his insistence upon submission by his subjects to authority in religious matters, while on the other hand she avoids branding as atheism his investigating attitude on spiritual as on other intellectual questions.

While not without disputable points, *The Amazing Frederic* presents to the reader a thoroughly interesting and a not too "amazing" human being. Because of the directness and vigor of the narrative there is not one dull page in the book. The pen and ink drawings by Mr. Taylor are good.

Mount Holyoke College. J. M. Tatlock.

Opicinus de Canistris: Weltbild und Bekenntnisse eines avignonesischen Klerikers des 14. Jahrhunderts. Von Richard Salomon. Mit Beiträgen von A. Heimann und R. Krautheimer. [Studies of the Warburg Institute.] Two volumes. (London: the Institute. 1936. Pp. vi, 348. Plates XLV.)

Dr. Salomon has here brought out the fruits of many years of patient and enlightened labor. He has in one volume (*Tafeln*) reproduced photostatically a fourteenth century manuscript of drawings, *Codex Palatinus Latinus 1993;* and in the other (*Textband*) he has given us a partial transcription of the text that accompanies these designs, an explanatory commentary on it, and an analysis of the author's mentality and culture. There are in addition two appendixes to this volume: one on the double cathedral of Pavia (which is

the subject of one of the drawings of the codex) by Richard Krautheimer; and the other by Adelheid Heimann on the artistic qualities of these designs in general.

This fourteenth century codex, valuable as it is in itself, has proved indispensable in settling an interesting point of literary history. For one of its tables contains a biographical sketch which establishes beyond doubt that the person who drew these designs had also written the well-known eulogy of Pavia whose author had remained a mystery to scholars ever since Muratori published it, ascribing it to an "anonymous Ticinensis". It is true that the name of Opicinus nowhere appears in this manuscript, but in addition to the fact that it could easily be guessed from the puns on the name which occur in the text, it also clearly results from the mention, in the said biographical sketch, of another work of the author, *viz.*, the *Tractatus de preeminentia spiritualis,* which, already known as existing in three fifteenth century manuscripts, appeared in them under the name of Opicinus de Canistris. (This work was published by Richard Scholz in his *Unbekannte kirchenpolitische Streitschriften aus der Zeit Ludwigs des Bayern.*)

The drawings themselves are most strange and obscure—Mr. Salomon calls them moralized charts. For they are, usually, maps articulated with human figures surrounded and adorned by zodiacal signs, accompanied by schematic calendars and expounded, or rather confused, by glosses that make of them mirrors of the author's confused mentality and of his religious and political views.

The task of getting some kind of sense out of these fantastic designs and of their explanatory texts is by no means an easy one. Dr. Salomon has brought to it all the extensive resources of his scholarship in the fields of theology, astrology, geography, cartography, etc. and has indeed succeeded in solving many problems. His four introductory chapters, which constitute the first part of his *Textband,* give us in systematic and continuous form the results of his findings and enable us to reconstruct the milieu of this strange cleric in the surroundings of the Avignon papal court.

I believe, however, that the publication could have been made more useful if the text had always been transcribed and printed in its entirety. Mr. Salomon expresses the belief that it is possible to read with comparative ease the facsimile by the aid of a magnifying glass, but this is by no means always the case. Such a complete transcription would have facilitated the task of other scholars who, without too great trouble, might desire to look into some of these riddles. It would also have enabled the reader to check up more completely on Mr. Salomon's interpretation, which is not, and could not possibly be, entirely faultless.

This study of Opicinus's work and personality as determined by the analysis of the codex above mentioned was preceded by the work of Faustino Gianani, *Opicino de Canistris, l'Anonimo Ticinese Cod. Vaticano Palatino*

Latino 1993 (Pavia, 1927), which the present work does not in any way duplicate but rather complements.

Columbia University. DINO BIGONGIARI.

The St. Albans Chronicle, 1406-1420. Edited from Bodley MS. 462 by V. H. GALBRAITH. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1937. Pp. lxxv, 164. $7.70.)

IN this volume is printed for the first time and from a unique manuscript the fullest surviving version of the St. Albans chronicle for the years 1406 to 1420. It should, as the editor predicts, supersede the shorter version long available in the second volume of the *Historia Anglicana,* edited by H. T. Riley for the Rolls series. Aside from the fact that the newly edited text is printed from a superior manuscript, it contains considerable fresh information.

In an article in the *English Historical Review* of 1932 (XLVII, 12-30) Mr. Galbraith indicated the interconnection of the extant manuscripts of the St. Albans chronicle and attributed the authorship of the various surviving versions, printed and unprinted, to Thomas Walsingham. Riley had contended that several authors had been at work, a conclusion concurred in by Maunde Thompson but challenged by Gairdner and by Kingsford. Mr. Galbraith goes further than the latter two, however. They relied mainly on their impressions gained from reading the various texts of the chronicle; he, with the newly discovered text as a key, has subjected the surviving manuscripts to a complicated and searching analysis. In the introduction to the present edition he presents the results of his analysis in a long and valuable discussion on the descent of the chronicle. He views the chronicle as a unity, surviving in two recensions, one full and one shortened, written in the tradition of Matthew Paris. He makes a convincing case for his deductions, although, as he himself admits, the anonymity of the manuscripts makes demonstrative proof difficult.

Since no single surviving manuscript contains the full text of the chronicle, it has never been printed as a whole and must now be pieced together from four books: the *Chronicon Angliae,* the *Historia Anglicana,* the *Annales Ricardi II et Henrici IV,* and the present volume (see p. xlvi). The sources from which Walsingham obtained his information about contemporary events are unknown, but into his narrative he incorporated official documents, political and ecclesiastical, and it is these, usually omitted from the short version, which give to the full text its superior importance. In the introduction (pp. xv-xvi, xxii) the editor lists the chief items of new material now printed for the first time. The fresh details for the reign of Henry IV are of greater interest than those for the reign of his son. Of outstanding importance are the account of the parliament of 1406 (pp. 2-3) and the signet letter of Prince Henry to his father written in 1412 (pp. 65-7).

The fresh information here contained has already been utilized by Mr. McFarlane in his chapter on the Lancastrians in the last volume of the *Cambridge Medieval History* (VIII, 372-73, 378). For ecclesiastical history the most significant document is the sermon of the archbishop of Bordeaux delivered before Henry IV in 1408 (pp. 31-39; see also Appendix II).

The discovery of the full text of the St. Albans chronicle from 1406 to 1420 has robbed Capgrave and Otterbourne of the small value they were once thought to have as separate sources for the reigns of Henry IV and his son. Mr. Galbraith concludes that both these compilers relied almost entirely on the work of Walsingham. The St. Albans chronicle and the *Gesta Henrici Quinti* remain the only strictly contemporary chronicles for the first two decades of the fifteenth century.

Mr. Galbraith has edited the St. Albans chronicle with the same ability and thoroughness which he displayed in his edition of the *Anonimalle Chronicle* (1927). His notes simplify the use of the text by the student, and a good index renders further aid. Four plates from the manuscripts elucidate the argument of the introduction. In an appendix the editor has indicated the chief additions, up to 1406, of Bodley MS. 462 to the text of the manuscripts known to Riley. In format and in typography the book is worthy of the best traditions of the Clarendon Press.

Rockford College. ISABEL R. ABBOTT.

L'empereur dans l'art byzantin: Recherches sur l'art officiel de l'Empire d'Orient. By ANDRÉ GRABAR. [La Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg.] (Paris: Les belles lettres. 1936. Pp. viii, 296. Plates XL. 75 fr.)

BYZANTIUM, profoundly penetrated by the influence of the Orthodox Church, was, we know, the home of an art which devoted its best creative forces to the service of the Christian faith. The official religion inspired most Byzantine masterpieces and the great bulk of Byzantine monuments which remain to us. But, according to M. Grabar, another influence besides Orthodoxy, though in complete accord with it, affected Byzantine civilization during the existence of the Empire; this was the Monarchy by Divine Right, where the emperor is God's representative on earth and as such is the object of a particular mysticism which has its own place in the Byzantine religious system.

The author poses and answers the question of whether this Byzantine imperial "religion", like the Christian faith, tried to express its ideas and its doctrine in the plastic arts. The reader, therefore, must not expect to find in this volume a study on the iconography of different Byzantine emperors. It is the Emperor and not the emperors in Byzantine art, the symbolic representation of their power and not of their physical traits, that interests the author. By investigating the works of art of the *basileis,* he attempts to

discover, and comes to certain conclusions about, the influence of this imperial "religion".

The book consists of three parts. The first deals with monuments of art and their themes and has several divisions: Imperial portraits *à mi-corps*, standing, sitting on the throne, or sometimes in groups (coemperors, corulers, emperor and empress); monuments expressing in various ways the idea of imperial victory (the emperor triumphant); the theme of the emperor and his subjects, as the adoration of the emperor, the emperor presiding over councils, etc.; finally, monuments representing the emperor in relation to Christ, the emperor in adoration, the emperor making offerings to Christ or the Holy Virgin, most frequently the model of a church founded by the emperor. One very popular theme is Christ crowning the emperor. The second part of the book, entitled "An Historical Study", is an attempt to show briefly the connection between the themes mentioned above and the historical evolution of the Byzantine Empire beginning with the fourth century. Finally, the third part, entitled "Imperial Art and Christian Art", deals with the very interesting problem of the reciprocal influences of these two. Imperial art, deriving from the art of the pagan Roman Empire, which in its turn goes back to the art of the Hellenistic and Oriental monarchies, considerably affected Christian art, both as to the formation of Christian iconography and as to the treatment of certain Scriptural subjects, especially in the fourth and fifth centuries. But the equilibrium between these two branches of art apparently disappeared towards the end of the Empire, when imperial art was in a state of definite decadence. Examination of the works of imperial art confirms the fact, which perhaps has not yet been adequately emphasized, that in the domain of the plastic arts the "renaissance of the Palaeologi" manifested itself almost exclusively in religious painting.

Forty beautiful plates reproduce over sixty monuments of art and a number of coins. Most of these monuments are well known; there is very little here that is new. But the author has shown great discrimination in selecting the subjects for reproduction and gives several new interpretations. His book is based on his profound knowledge of written and monumental material and is a very important contribution to the history of Byzantine art in particular and of Byzantine civilization in general.

University of Wisconsin. A. Vasiliev.

The Library of Pico della Mirandola. By Pearl Kibre. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1936. Pp. 330. $4.00.)

In this study of one of the most celebrated privately owned libraries of the fifteenth century Miss Kibre examines the literary resources of a scholar whose short but brilliant career made a profound impression upon his own and later generations. While Pico's priceless manuscripts and rare editions were destroyed, probably by fire in 1687, it is possible, nevertheless, thanks

to the literary detective work and competent scholarship of Miss Kibre, to become acquainted with this magnificent collection of 1190 volumes and to estimate its value. The reconstruction of the library is based upon records of its contents preserved in catalogues or inventories, one of which, hitherto unpublished, is reproduced in the appendix.

The Greek collection, the first division of the library to be considered, though smaller than that of the Greek scholar, Cardinal Bessarion, and that of the Medici, compared favorably with the collections of other Italian scholars of the day and totally eclipsed those of scholars outside of Italy. Greek classics in philosophy and literature occupied a prominent place in the library, and classics in science were well represented. The major portion of the philosophical treatises, it should be noted, pertained to the school of Aristotle, whom Pico, like most of his literary contemporaries, preferred to Plato or to any other Greek philosopher.

Of particular interest to students of the Scriptures is the Oriental division of the library, for Pico had the distinction of owning one of the largest Hebrew collections in all Italy. His enthusiasm for Oriental languages, particularly Hebrew, suggests the new interest exhibited by fifteenth century Humanists in the textual study of the Bible and the Talmud.

But even more impressive than the Greek and Oriental sections of the library was the Latin division. It is this collection of nine hundred volumes, moreover, ranging chronologically from the era of the Roman Republic to Pico's own day, that reveals, as Miss Kibre points out, the chief interests of Pico as a writer and as a scholar. The numerous books and manuscripts of Latin literature testify to his enthusiasm for contemporary Humanism, while those of theology and philosophy reflect his interest in medieval Scholasticism.

In the field of the occult the library contained a number of treatises by early Arabic and Jewish astrologers in Latin translation and some of later date by European writers, and in the field of natural science many representative volumes. Among the scientific books were several by Euclid, who, in Pico's opinion, was a dangerous companion for theologians. Treatises on medicine were more numerous than any other class of scientific works, though Pico wrote little on the art of healing except in its relation to astrology.

In reconstructing this famous library and connecting each division with the owner's writings and with contemporary literary tastes, Miss Kibre has shed light upon the intellectual history of the fifteenth century. Students of the Humanistic revival in Italy will welcome this study, which will enrich all future research in a great cultural movement. It is peculiarly fitting, finally, that the modern literary world should be united in thought and spirit, not only through his writings but through knowledge of the masters who inspired him, with this earnest and gifted young Humanist.

"For the essence of humanism", says Pater, in writing of Pico, "is that belief of which he seems never to have doubted, that nothing which has ever interested living men and women can wholly lose its vitality."

Hunter College. MINNIE CLARE YARBOROUGH.

History of Parliament: Biographies of the Members of the Commons House, 1439-1509. By Colonel the Right Honourable JOSIAH C. WEDGWOOD, M. P., in collaboration with ANNE D. HOLT. (London: H. M. Stationery Office; New York: British Library of Information. 1936. Pp. lv, 984. $10.25.)

THE scope of the *History* of which this is the first volume to appear has been indicated in this journal (XLII, 201). The publication may extend to some forty volumes and will require years for its completion. It has the official support of parliament, to one of whose members, Colonel Josiah C. Wedgwood, its initiation is due. Appropriately the introduction to the volume before us is written by him, and his zealous devotion to an institution in which "freedom and experience ever grow" is apparent throughout. However the *History* may develop, his name should always be associated with it.

In 1932 the committee appointed "to report on the materials available for a record of the personnel and politics of past members of the House of Commons from 1264 to 1832 and on the cost and desirability of publication" presented a valuable interim report (Cmd. 4130). Recommending the undertaking because of the world-wide influence and prestige of parliament, it enumerated topics to be elucidated and reviewed existent literature, explaining that the *Official Return* of 1878, compiled from sheriffs' returns and writs *de expensis*, had hitherto served as the accepted list of members. But it revealed in one of several useful appendixes that six to seven thousand names have since been recovered. Of these nearly fourteen hundred are from the so-called "blank period", 1459-1545, for which, except in the case of a few parliaments, the sheriffs' returns have been lost. The committee noted the manuscript material which might profitably be examined to build up around all names brief biographies. The outcome of the examination of such sources for the seventy years, 1439-1509, is now in part before us.

For this period, as for others earlier and later, the findings are to be arranged in three volumes. One volume is biographical, giving whatever pertinent matter can be found about the lives of all known members of the Commons. The second is to contain "lists and analyses of all Members of both Houses in each successive Parliament with brief identification—offices, party, age, constituency and experience". The third will analyze the other two, making deductions about parliamentary activity and development during the period covered. While the first contains the basic information, the others will reset this so that conclusions of historical import may be drawn.

We need not, however, wait for the remaining volumes on the period 1439-1509 to glean something of what they will disclose, for Colonel Wedgwood's introduction is written with a premonition of this. A few of his deductions may be noted.

It happens that the last forty-nine years of the seventy fall within the "blank period". They are therefore a difficult stretch of parliamentary history to reconstruct. Although the first twenty-one years of the seventy have yielded names satisfactorily enough in the *Official Return,* yet the recovery of 890 names after 1460 is no small achievement. They make the total number of names for which biographies are attempted 2600. Presumably some 1200 names are still missing. Of the 2600 about 2% remain mere names, and for a further 4% there are only two or three references apiece.

The biographies are condensed to an average of 150 words each, some being shorter, some longer. Space is saved by omitting references when the information is drawn from pardons, inquisitions *post mortem,* and from the calendars of patent rolls, the last being the source of one half of the material of the biographies. Manuscript sources examined include the pardon rolls, the issue rolls, and the fine rolls. Though one can understand reluctance to search voluminous exchequer records, it is questionable whether the receipt rolls, the records of the duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall, and the household accounts should have been altogether neglected. As long as the issue rolls, which were drawn up from the receipt rolls, are available (to the early years of Edward IV), the neglect of the latter is not so serious as it is for a later time. In the duchies were coveted posts, and the household accounts give precise and important information about the status and length of service of household officials.

Colonel Wedgwood, speaking of household officials, pregnantly remarks: "It is clear that throughout the seventy years . . . the two real parties in Parliament were Court and Country. The 'servants' were the back benchers of the Court party; the squires the backbone of the Country party". This significant statement needs expansion and proof, such as may be contained in one of the forthcoming volumes. It implies that the presence of bona fide household servants in any parliament is of considerable importance. Household and other records, however, seem to show that many men who in their earlier years held posts at court came at a later time to acquire land or offices in the counties and to become country gentlemen, esquires, or knights. Often they served as J. P.'s for a series of years. If this transformation did take place, it is necessary to know at what stage of a household official's career he sat in parliament. If early, he may have been a retainer of the court; if late, a spokesman of the country. The household accounts have something to tell about this. The accounts, too, would have made clear that a king's carver and a knight of the body were one and the same, and that there was only one sewer (pp. xxx, xxxix). In the light of these

accounts, too, it can scarcely be said that acts of resumption were "the normal weapon to oust a Government . . . salaries and the equivalent of salaries ceased" (p. xli). Justifiable salaries of household and other officials were protected in acts of resumption, only excessive grants being annulled.

Touching the status of members of the Commons Colonel Wedgwood makes many valuable generalizations, tending to show that the Commons in parliament were to a large extent the most eminent residents of counties and boroughs. On the other hand, many members stood close to the court or the government. Before estimating the influence of the latter on legislation, however, it will be necessary to ascertain at what period in their careers they served as members of parliament, since in some instances they may have passed into the country gentry. Perhaps the publication of the *Lists* will enable us to do this.

Representation of a county by nonresident "carpetbaggers" was infrequent, since knights of the shire often had property in different counties. The dozen instances relate to small or distant shires. In the case of borough members nonresidence was more common, though difficult to define because burgesses shaded into retired merchants living outside and into local gentry. If only those living outside the county in which the borough was situated are counted, there were 300 carpetbaggers among the borough members. If strictly non-residents are counted, more than one half the borough M. P.'s were such. In these seats lay the opportunity for the use of influence and for ambitious men. At least lawyer members were not yet numerous, there being perhaps 250 of them.

These bald statements culled from Colonel Wedgwood's introduction illustrate what the volume and its successors are likely to yield to students of parliamentary history. In due course we shall be able to interpret the legislation of successive parliaments in the light of knowledge of the personnel, prejudices, and politics of the legislators. The work will take its place beside the *D.N.B.* and Cokayne's *Peerage*.

Bryn Mawr College. H. L. Gray.

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Queen Elizabeth and the English Catholic Historians. By Joseph Bernard Code, docteur en sciences historiques, Louvain. (Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université. 1935. Pp. xliv, 230.)

This book is a valuable contribution to the historiography of Queen Elizabeth. It presents in summary form the contributions made to the understanding of her life and reign by all the outstanding English Roman Catholic historians from her days to these. And it makes some attempt to evaluate their contributions in terms of objective historical scholarship. The best part of it is that which deals with the writings of Elizabeth's contem-

poraries. The works of Sander, Allen, Persons, Fitzherbert, Watson, and the rest are well described and their position in the current quarrels between Jesuits and seculars clearly defined. It would have been helpful, particularly in a work which is definitely bibliographical in character, had Dr. Code given us a complete list of Elizabethan Catholic pamphlets, and had he cleared up some of the doubts about their authorship. So many of them were put forward under assumed names or under no name at all. In the case of the most notable of the anonymous pamphlets, currently known as *Leicester's Commonwealth* and often ascribed to Persons, the Jesuit, Dr. Code says positively that it was by Charles Arundel, basing his statement upon a more judiciously qualified statement by John Hungerford Pollen. The suggestion is a plausible one, but Pollen gave no evidence in support of it, and certainly it is not a matter which we can regard as settled.

After the Elizabethans the book jumps at once to the Roman Catholic historians of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and finishes off with chapters on John Hungerford Pollen and Hilaire Belloc. It is easy to agree with Dr. Code's flattering estimate of Father Pollen's work. Indeed, one is tempted to say that he rather understates the case. Though one cannot always agree with Father Pollen, one cannot fail to recognize that he was not only an honest and careful scholar but also a generous, broad-minded man. No one has done more to sift the wheat from the chaff in the case for Roman Catholicism under Elizabeth. In his case, to a much greater degree than in the case of any other Roman Catholic historian of the period, he has definitely subordinated his zeal for his faith to his zeal for the truth. Perhaps it would be better to say that he was so well assured of the essential rightness of his religious position that he could not see the necessity of distorting the facts of history in order to justify it. The same can certainly not be said of Hilaire Belloc. He is a devotee first and a historian afterwards—a long way afterwards. Much of what he says is definitely and provably wrong. Much more of what he says is so obviously partisan that it will do more among the judiciously minded to weaken the case for the Elizabethan Catholics than to strengthen it. With Pollen honest historians of all creeds could feel that they were working at a common task and participating in a common pursuit of the truth. With Belloc history becomes once more a sectarian affair in the crudest sense of the term and the story of the past simply a battleground for contending creeds.

It ought to be remarked that Dr. Code himself is on the whole refreshingly free from marked religious bias either towards the Catholics as against the Protestants or towards one of the Catholic factions as against the other. He would do well to revise his estimate of Elizabeth in the light of Professor Neale's notable biography, and he would certainly do well to read his proof with more care. There are easily a hundred mistakes in his text, most of

them so obvious as to be innocuous but all of them annoying. It is a pity that a book which reveals so many major virtues should be disfigured by so many minor vices.

University of Pennsylvania. CONYERS READ.

The Development of Religious Toleration in England from the Accession of James I to the Convention of the Long Parliament, 1603-1640. By W. K. JORDAN, Instructor in History, Harvard University. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1936. Pp. 542. $5.00.)

THIS book, the second volume of Dr. Jordan's definitive history of the development of toleration in England, covers the crucial years between 1603 and 1640. Puritanism and Anglicanism were then struggling for the mastery of the Church of England; sectarianism was making its surreptitious way from Holland into England; and Roman Catholicism was declining in influence, a gradual process which was not fully perceived by the Anglican leaders. The history of religious thought is compendiously treated from all these angles.

The fact that the secular-minded Elizabeth was succeeded by the Stuarts is regarded by Dr. Jordan as the chief reason for the misfortunes of the Church of England in the mid-century. For whether Protestant, crypto-Catholic, or Roman Catholic, the Stuarts felt a personal, not a statesmanlike, interest in religion, and James I by his repulse of the Puritans at the beginning of the century prevented England from achieving religious unity just as Charles I later did by his advancement of Anglo-Catholics. This unity, Dr. Jordan feels, could and should have been attained by making "every possible compromise with the Puritan opposition, even if the external fabric of the Church should be radically changed by these concessions". But he does not seem to realize that the result would have been the alienation of the Catholic-minded churchmen, who would consequently have increased the number of Roman Catholics or created a new and hostile minority group. To have made the concessions which the Puritans demanded would have meant the abandonment of the *via media* of Elizabeth and her bishops.

Laud's efforts, when he succeeded the Calvinistic Archbishop Abbot, to redress the balance, to recover the church from rigid Calvinism, and to keep alive its liturgical beauty are unsparingly condemned by Dr. Jordan. Matthew Arnold's dictum that "the persistence of the Church in pressing for conformity arose, not . . . from the lust of haughty ecclesiastics, but from a real sense that their formularies were made so large and open, and the sense put upon subscription to them was so indulgent that any reasonable man could honestly conform" presents a point of view with which the author has no sympathy. To him Laud and his fellow Anglicans "appeared to lean too far in the direction of Rome, prostituted the Church of England to their

own ends and thereby destroyed the catholicity of the Church of England". Yet Laud by his welcome of Arminian doctrines prepared the way for latitudinarianism and the development of a broad dogmatic basis for the church.

Dr. Jordan's treatment of sectarianism is undoubtedly the most valuable part of the book. The Brownists, he shows, were developing "the voluntary church principle", with its consequent denial of the coercive power of the magistrate, and were thereby making an important contribution to the growth of toleration. But their insistence that they alone constituted the true church shows that they had not yet grasped the principle of toleration.

It was the Baptist writers, such as John Smyth, Helwys, and Murton, who in Dr. Jordan's opinion were responsible for real progress in this period. Not only did they systematize the thought of their predecessors, but they modified it to meet contemporary conditions. On practical as well as on moral grounds they pointed out the need of toleration. Because this toleration was essentially a part of Baptist thought, rather than the reflection of its apologists' temperance of mind, Dr. Jordan maintains that the Baptist contribution is worthy of comparison with the "noble system of comprehension" of Elizabeth.

The two alternatives to persecution—toleration, with a consequent growth of sectarianism, and comprehension, or the broadening of the national church to include all shades of opinion—have been dealt with by Dr. Jordan with a wealth of detail and with admirable clarity. Not a stone has been left unturned in his tireless search for material. The great interpretations, such as those of Gardiner, Tulloch, and Troeltsch, have been called upon to provide background or support a thesis but have not been used slavishly. In the main the author has relied upon the pamphlet material of the time. Yet he has not disregarded such significant sources as the debates in the House of Commons or the state papers, and he has found in the poetry of the period a reflection of contemporary thought on toleration. The book must be regarded as one of the most important contributions to the history of thought in recent years.

Providence. ETHYN WILLIAMS KIRBY.

Bishop Butler and the Age of Reason. By ERNEST C. MOSSNER. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1936. Pp. xv, 271. $2.50.)

MR. Mossner's purpose is to present Butler's ideas, especially those in the *Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature,* in the intellectual milieu of his time. This, on the level of logical discourse, he does very effectively. With much learned detail skillfully marshaled he sets forth the issues that called forth Butler's famous book, makes a critical analysis of the book itself, and shows how Butler's argument in support of revealed by analogy with natural religion could be

used and was used for the support or the destruction of all religions alike.

Reason as the handmaid of religion had been known to Christian philosophers long before the eighteenth century. But in the Age of Enlightenment it was emancipated from that inferior status: provided with Divine credentials, it was gladly welcomed as worthy to rank with revelation as the interpreter of God's purposes. For a brief happy moment it was taken for granted that religion and science, being alike validated by reason, were in complete accord. But it was inevitable that someone should ask the ominous question: "If God has revealed himself in his Works, in the Book of Nature as interpreted by reason, is there need of a special revelation?" One obvious answer was, no need at all. Natural religion, derived by reason from the natural order, would be sufficient, the more so since it was as "old as creation" and universally applicable since universally intelligible. Of the many Christian apologists who defended the traditional religion against this conclusion Butler was the most effective and the most widely read.

Butler's method of defending the Christian religion was the dubious one of proving by analogy that revelation was a special "promulgation", a de luxe edition of natural religion. Taking it for granted that the rational foundations of natural religion were impregnable, his problem was to demonstrate that revealed religion rested upon the same rational foundation, so that if the one was accepted the other must be accepted also. The chief difficulty was to prove that the special revelation was a part of the natural order. But the belief in a special revelation rested upon the fact of divine intervention—upon miracle. Very well. Butler argues that the natural order is itself no less a miracle than the special revelation. As "there is a presumption of millions to one against the story of Caesar or any other man", the additional presumption against a miracle can have no "practical significance" (p. 93). In other words, if one accepts the premise that an omniscient and omnipotent God created the natural order, it is as easy to believe that he gave Moses a special revelation as it is to believe that he endowed Caesar with extraordinary talents. Mr. Mossner thinks the argument specious. "The improbability *before* the fact of the story of Caesar is immense, but disappears *after* testimony. Yet the improbability of a miracle remains even *after* testimony, because the presumption here is not against one *particular* event, but against that *kind* of event". Why the presumption is against that kind of event, Mr. Mossner does not ask; had he done so he might have clarified his subject more than he has done. The vital point here is not testimony but the disposition of people to accept testimony as establishing this or that kind of event. The important fact is that for Bishop Butler, and for most other people in his day, the improbability of miracle did *not* remain after testimony, and the important question is why not? Obviously because the presumption, for Butler and for those who shared his conception of God as the creator and governor of the universe

and man in it, was not against but in favor of precisely that kind of event.

Apart from the wide acceptance of this presumption there is nothing to say about Butler's argument except that it is fallacious. Apart from Butler's first premises, which were those of his time, his argument has no point or meaning, the concept of natural religion and the entire controversy over natural versus revealed religion have no point and no meaning. Given his premises, Butler's book had point and effectiveness for his time; it had its day and its fame. If its day was short, that was so, not because the argument was fallacious, but because abler men than Butler, for reasons to be found below the level of logical discourse, were already convinced that the Christian story was a myth and were therefore predisposed to examine its premises with detachment, that is to say with a prejudice against them. So examined, the whole structure collapsed. All unwittingly Butler and his disciples contributed to this collapse, since it was quite within reason, as Mr. Mossner says, "to maintain in answer to [Butler's] negative case for Revelation, not that both Revelation and Natural Religion should therefore be accepted, but that both should therefore be rejected". It was Hume who presented most devastatingly the case against reason as a foundation for religion. In his *Dialogues concerning Natural Religion* he demonstrated that reason is incapable of establishing either the existence or the goodness of God, and that there is no assured basis for religion, either revealed or natural, except faith. Christian mystics and atheists, he maintains, obviously agree on the main point, that reason is incompetent to answer ultimate questions, and he closes with that ironical remark: "To be a philosophical sceptic is, in a man of letters, the first and most essential step, towards being a sound, believing Christian".

Cornell University. CARL BECKER.

Les exercices budgétaires, 1790 et 1791, d'après les comptes du trésor. Par F. BRAESCH, professeur à l'Université de Nancy. [Finances et monnaie révolutionnaires, I.] (Nancy; Paris: Maison du livre français. 1934. Pp. vii, 125.)

Les recettes et les dépenses du trésor pendant l'année 1789; Le comte Rendu au roi de Mars, 1788; Le dernier budget de l'ancien régime. Par F. BRAESCH. [II.] (Paris: Maison du livre français. 1936. Pp. 253.)

La livre tournois et le franc de germinal: Essai sur la monnaie métallique. Par F. BRAESCH. [V.] (*Ibid.* Pp. 264.)

THE task which Professor Braesch set for himself in the first, and in the first part of the second, of these volumes, was to construct analytical tables and graphs of the receipts and expenditures of the first three years of the Revolution. Incidentally he intended to reproduce for the student of

Revolutionary finances the monthly printed statements of the treasury—*états du trésor*—which were issued from May, 1790, on. The author's predecessors have contented themselves with making use of the figures given by ministers or chairmen of committees, instead of going to these *états du trésor,* from which ministers as well as committees had to work. It is, of course, impossible to get at the manuscript records, for they perished in the fires of the Commune. What gives these statements so much importance is the fact that, under a commission immediately answerable to the assembly, the treasury became the actual financial center of the administration, practically independent of the ministry of finances. Even with these treasury statements it is difficult to arrive at an accurate list of receipts and expenditures for any given year because so many items on both sides of the account belong to the preceding or the succeeding year. The first *états du trésor* did not indicate the year in which such items originated, but this was done in 1791. Another difficulty arises from repeated changes in the system of accounting. For 1789 the principal source of information is Necker's *Compte général* of July 21, 1790. Among the many interesting facts which Professor Braesch's investigations have brought out is the manner in which the Constituent Assembly compromised the success of the passage from the practices of the Old Regime to a new and sounder system by the device of extraordinary budgets, especially the creation of the *Caisse de l'extraordinaire,* with its fund of assignats, behind which growing deficits could be hidden by the simple expedient of marking expenses special and transferring them to the new Caisse. Another mistake was the hurried dismantling of the old tax system before the new plan was ready to be put into effect, with the result that the land tax in 1791 furnished only a sixth of what it was expected to produce.

In the second and third parts of the second volume Professor Braesch goes back to the last year of the Old Regime, analyzes its financial situation on the basis of Loménie de Brienne's *Compte rendu* of March, 1788, and then sets up a formal budget for the purpose of comparisons with a modern French budget. The *Compte rendu,* it appears, is relatively inaccessible, with only three copies in the Bibliothèque nationale, none in the national archives, and only selected portions reproduced in the *Moniteur* and the *Archives parlementaires.* As the author's treatment runs to 130 pages—not much shorter than the original—and as nearly half of these are tables which reproduce the figures of the *Compte rendu* in a form more readily understood, he is practically offering a documentary publication. That is an important service since the *Compte rendu* is the most reliable picture we have of the Old Regime at its close. The comparisons the author elucidates with modern French practice are not altogether to the advantage of the latter. The Old Regime made at least an effort to repay borrowed capital.

One notes all through the discussions the author's concern with the problem of public indebtedness and his desire to seek some light from the past upon present dangers.

The third volume deals with the monetary reform of the Consulate, touching incidentally certain legislative projects of the Revolutionary assemblies. The distinguishing feature of this reform was that the money of account, formerly the livre tournois, now the franc, became also the principal coin in circulation, and that its value was defined by its weight, five grams of silver, nine tenths fine. An end was put to the kind of managed currency characteristic of the Old Regime prior to 1726, when the "rois faux-monnayeurs" helped themselves to the substance of their subjects by the simple expedient of increasing the number of livres tournois in the marc d'or or the marc d'argent. Professor Braesch regrets that the new money was not more closely incorporated in the metric system, as the Convention at one time intended. He is a convinced advocate of the gold standard and looks upon managed currencies as a retrograde move, a return to the mistaken if not corrupt practices of the old monarchs.

Western Reserve University. HENRY E. BOURNE.

Saint-Just, 1767-1794. Par D. CENTORE-BINEAU. Préface de Gérard Walter. [Bibliothèque historique.] (Paris: Payot. 1936. Pp. 292. 25 fr.)

THIS biography appears in a series which in general is addressed to the intelligent French public rather than to the specialist. M. Walter in the preface states that we are not dealing here with a work of pure erudition, since the author does not seek to conceal his profound admiration for his subject. With such an introduction, the book gets off to a bad start with the specialist. He is in some ways agreeably surprised upon reading it. M. Centore-Bineau has undoubtedly written the fullest and most readable life of Saint-Just that has yet appeared from the pen of a French author. Some of the situations are described with much liveliness and color, as for example, the condition of the army at Strasbourg, the journey of Elisabeth and Henriette with Le Bas and Saint-Just to Alsace, the events of the 9th and 10th Thermidor. The picture of the thick-headed, gigantic General Henriot, rushing around and kicking doors in with admirable vigor, yet scratching his head in puzzled vacillation at the moment of crisis, is particularly good.

Some of this vivid detail is undoubtedly from the sources. But, unhappily, much of it is undoubtedly from the imagination. The author suggests, "d'après certains", that Henriette passed in revolutionary circles for the mistress of Saint-Just and Eléonore for Robespierre's. This is of course possible, though its effect is to reduce the asceticism of these men considerably, and the author admits that he has no proof, one way or the other. But one can occasionally track down his tendency toward romantic exaggeration, as when Saint-Just recognizes Henriette's writing, "opens the letter precipi-

tately, reads it feverishly", then throws it to Le Bas, "en murmurant avec effort: 'C'est . . . pour toi seul . . .' et s'en va" (p. 222). The basis for this seems to be a letter from Le Bas to his wife on the 28th Floréal (recorded in Buchez et Roux, Vol. XXXV) in which he stated that a letter from Henriette had arrived, addressed to Saint-Just and himself, that "Saint-Just had opened and read it: he handed it to me without saying anything except that it was only for me. It had to do with Désiré, of whom I said a couple of words to him another time, which he seemed to hear with much indifference."

The book is practically without notes, so that nothing can be verified. Unless one happens to have a wide acquaintance with the literature of the subject, so that he can check from memory, it is dangerous to base any assumptions on it. There is an excessively meager bibliography of twenty-eight items, covering a single page.

The book is eulogistic and unanalytical. "Il est vrai que cette tâche était très simplifiée du fait que le projet de Saint-Just servit de base à la Constitution définitive" (p. 108). This is simply untrue. Much important material is omitted, for example, a consideration of Saint-Just's economic policy, the crossing of the Sambre, his relation to Robespierre. Criticism and judgment are lacking. One wonders whether the literate public is really served by a portrait so unretouched as this.

Goucher College. EUGENE N. CURTIS.

Bonaparte, gouverneur d'Égypte. Par FRANÇOIS CHARLES-ROUX, ambassadeur de France, membre de l'Institut. (Paris: Librairie Plon. 1936. Pp. 383. 30 fr.)

THE French occupation of Egypt from 1798 to 1801 has a peculiar interest because it marked the first time that the liberal ideas of the eighteenth century were applied to an oversea conquest. The invaders proposed to establish in the valley of the Nile the first colony in the world in which the inhabitants as well as the interests of the mother country would prosper. The Directory, in announcing the news of the occupation, made it plain that the Republic had accomplished an excellent feat which the monarchy had not dared to attempt. And Lafayette, eager to share in the glory, was proud to call attention to his efforts before the Revolution to persuade Louis XVI's ministers to seize Egypt. He and his fellow liberals seem to have been convinced that the French could do naught but good, or at least more good than harm, among the fellahin who had long suffered under the sterile despotism of the Mameluke beys. It would doubtless have pleased them to know that the French collected one third less revenue from the Egyptians than had the Mamelukes.

In this volume M. Charles-Roux confines his attention to the first thirteen months of the occupation, that is, to the period of Bonaparte's "governorship" or "proconsulship". The first of the fifteen chapters opens with

an account of the colonial objects of the expedition. These objects Bonaparte took seriously from the outset. And unlike Talleyrand, who eventually recommended the abandonment of Egypt, he never regarded the new conquest as anything but a permanent possession. M. Charles-Roux sees definite proof of this attitude in the instructions which he left for Kléber on his departure for France. He believes, moreover, that throughout the period of the Empire Napoleon cherished the hope of regaining control of Egypt, witness his persistent refusal to allow the publication of a detailed map of that region lest his enemies put it to use.

The tone of the book is sober and restrained. Although M. Charles-Roux clearly admires Bonaparte's administration in Egypt—he compares it to that of Lyautey in Morocco—he does not hesitate to point out its weaknesses. The fruit of long years of research, this is undoubtedly the best study of the subject. An English translation has recently been published in London.

On the scholarly side, it is regrettable that the author did not provide his useful volume with footnote references in addition to the bibliography of sixty-five titles. One would often like to know the exact source of a particular statement. For this reason it seems fitting to mention that chapters I, IV, and V are here reprinted with a few changes and additions from articles originally published with footnotes in the *Revue des études napoléoniennes* (vols. XXII-XXIV, 1924-1925), while the important chapter VI appeared with footnotes in the *Revue historique* (Sept., 1933). On these portions of the book, therefore, it is possible to follow the author step by step.

The National Archives. CARL LUDWIG LOKKE.

Napoleon's Nemesis: The Life of Baron Stein. By CONSTANTIN DE GRUNWALD. Translated from the French by Charles Francis Atkinson. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1936. Pp. 321. $3.75.)

FROM time to time in the past fifty years there have issued from France studies on Prussian history which command the attention and admiration of scholars in all countries. One needs but to recall the names of Cavaignac, Pagès, Waddington, Lavisse, and Pariset. With certain reservations one may now add to this list the name of Constantin de Grunwald, a Russian writer now living in France, whose entertaining and dramatic life of Baron Stein has appeared in this successful English translation. As the title indicates, the study aims at the wide reading public of laymen and women interested in a great historical personality, in this case the passionate and implacable enemy of Napoleon. There is no elaborate scaffolding of documentary authority, but every page betrays a close and intimate acquaintanceship with the best Stein literature which recent years have produced in great abundance and a firm and intelligent grasp of all the bewildering problems

that beset the biographer of Stein. It is no derogatory criticism to say that Grunwald offers no fresh interpretation of the great Prussian statesman. The credit for having accomplished that must still be accorded to Gerhard Ritter, whose brilliant and sharply critical two-volume biography was published in 1931, on the occasion of the first centenary of Stein's death. By comparison Grunwald presents a warmer, more enthusiastic, and less critical appraisal of Stein. One cannot suppress the impression that the author feels something of an ideological kinship with the great German baron, who was as far removed from reaction as from the democratic liberalism of the French Revolution, a kinship which was intelligible in the work of the English historian Seeley but is a little surprising in a twentieth century biographer.

For decades it was the problem of the ideological background of the Prussian reform era of 1807 that preoccupied all the biographers of Stein. This problem may be said to have been laid to rest by Ritter's penetrating analysis of the contradictory elements, both feudal and progressive, of Stein's statesmanship. Grunwald, however, is less exclusively concerned with Stein the reformer, and his brief chapter on the reforms of 1807, though correct and adequate in the large, does not supersede for English readers the close study by the American, Guy Stanton Ford, *Stein and the Era of Reform in Prussia,* published fifteen years ago. It is less the dictator and renovator of Prussia who stands in the center of Grunwald's biography than Stein the statesman of the European opposition to Napoleon. Much the larger (and better) part of the volume is devoted to his career after his proscription by Napoleon—to the exiled conspirator who presently became the intimate adviser of the Russian Emperor Alexander I, to his return to Germany after the Napoleonic debacle of 1812 when he became the instigator of the German uprising, and finally to the administrator of the French occupied areas. It is on these latter phases of Stein's biography that Grunwald reveals a mastery of materials and a soundness of judgment that excite admiration. The undeniable brilliance and power of the narrative have lost nothing in the translation and are enhanced by frequent and apt quotations from Stein's correspondence, recently collected and published by Erich Botzenhart. On one point at least, the origin of Napoleon's decree of December 16, 1808, declaring Stein to be the enemy of France, he offers some new information. If there is anything to be criticized, it is that, in the opinion of the reviewer, the author has somewhat overworked Stein's hatred of France. Stein was a *homme politique* to the bone, and his hatred of France, not merely of Napoleon, was political, the robust hatred of a nationalist German who felt the growth of his nation to be stunted by the overweening power of France. It was perfectly compatible with a genuine respect for French culture. He consistently used the French language in

his correspondence with his wife and retained throughout his life a warm admiration for Turgot and other Frenchmen. It was a far cry from the nationalism of Stein to that of Treitschke.

The Ohio State University. WALTER L. DORN.

Talleyrand. By Comte de SAINT-AULAIRE. Translated from the French by George Frederic Lees and Frederick J. Stephens, with an Introduction by the former. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1937. Pp. xi, 370. $3.50.)

IN view of the small deluge of biographies of Talleyrand that appear to have been inspired by the approach of the hundredth anniversary of his death, it was perhaps inevitable that he should at last find a defender in the ranks of his countrymen. The French cherish long political memories, and the man who had left or betrayed so many parties had long to wait for an apologist. It is significant that in the person of the Comte de Saint-Aulaire the friendly biographer has come from among the career diplomatists, a profession unsuitable to great absorption in the passions of party strife.

There is no attempt here at a "definitive" biography such as was made by M. Lacour-Gayet. Instead we find a remarkable resemblance to the essays which Professor Crane Brinton brought out almost simultaneously under the title of *The Lives of Talleyrand*. The author concentrates on seeking to fix Talleyrand's role and on the analysis of his policies. He betrays only a secondary interest in describing his personality and his relationships. This is to be regretted, for, aside from a general distaste for the Revolution, he enjoys great freedom from animosities toward persons and causes.

Certainly Saint-Aulaire did not set out to whitewash his hero. He makes no effort to gloss over his vices and weaknesses, though insisting at all times on assigning them their proper place. It is true that Talleyrand could be counted upon to support the rising star, the highest bidder, but he made up in constancy what he lacked in fidelity. "He renounced his ideas when it was to his interest to do so, but he always returned to them" (p. 149). It is to the delineation and laudation of the political system to which these ideas gave rise that the author devotes himself. In fact the central theme of his work is an appeal to his countrymen to remain true to what he regards as Talleyrand's greatest legacies—Anglo-French friendship and Belgian independence. History once more is being written in the light of contemporary events.

It is not always easy to agree with Saint-Aulaire when he gives credit or assigns responsibilities. In spite of Talleyrand's betrayal of Napoleon, he is not reproached with contributing materially to the ruin of the Empire. Napoleon was doomed by the *fatal* contradictions in his policy after Tilsit, and Talleyrand, foreseeing the inevitable, merely "speculated for a fall". Only in the final episode, from the departure of Marie Louise from Paris to the conversion of the czar to his views, did he play a decisive role. But

Napoleon's fate was already sealed, and here at least Chateaubriand is correct in his claim that Talleyrand signed his name to events and did not bring them about. Elsewhere the author disagrees emphatically with this interpretation. The "Prince of Diplomats" probably saved France from anarchy and dismemberment in 1814, was the "arbiter" at Vienna in the following year, and (the claims in favor of Palmerston notwithstanding) exercised the decisive influence in gaining the independence of Belgium. Saint-Aulaire's enthusiasm quite runs away with him at the end, so that his last chapter varies between a panegyric and an apologia, which does not shrink from comparing Talleyrand's treasons to the acts of contemporaries like Stein, who was "in the Russian ranks while his sovereign was the forced ally of Napoleon against Russia" (p. 335).

The work on the whole is very well written, though suffering from the too frequent and at times extravagant use of simile and metaphor. The translation is excellent, and the translator's notes are well placed, though apparently selected for a public whose knowledge of the period is elementary.

The University of Minnesota. HAROLD C. DEUTSCH.

British Corporation Finance, 1775-1850: A Study of Preference Shares. By GEORGE HERBERTON EVANS. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1936. Pp. 208. $2.25.)

SOME of us are old enough to remember the amazement and admiration stirred by the appearance, twenty-five years ago, of Professor W. R. Scott's monumental study of the constitution and finances of British joint-stock companies. But Scott stopped at 1720 and gave no hint that he would go any further. The later story has therefore been left for others to tell, and during the last decade half a dozen articles, written by Todd, Hunt, and Shannon, have given evidence of the vigorous excavation that is going on at different points along the corporation front.

Mr. Evans joins this little band of workers with a study which shows his industry with the spade and his skill in piecing fragmentary findings together. The result is a valuable contribution to the narrow field of business history and to the wider one of economic development. Its thesis is that the preference share emerged as a device for allowing financially embarrassed canal and railroad companies to raise more money in order to complete construction. These companies invariably started with an inadequate understanding of the engineering problems ahead of them, and their construction costs exceeded the total share capital they had raised and the total loan capital they were permitted to borrow. An unfinished railroad or canal was useless and could earn no income. More money must be obtained, or that already spent would be wasted. The hard-pressed directors sought to raise funds in various ways. They tried to get shareholders to meet calls on them,

i.e., to pay up the full face value of the shares they had taken. But the shareholders were shy; why should they throw good money after bad? Mortgages were raised, annuities were offered, bonds were issued, promissory notes were tendered, and even government aid was obtained when the state felt disposed to advance money in order to "make work" during a depression. But eventually the plan was developed of offering timid investors a share which would have preference in the distribution of any profits that might be made when income began to flow in. The first railway preference share was authorized by parliament in 1829, and by 1850 between ten and fifteen per cent of the share capital of British railroads was in preferred shares. Similar shares were sold later to finance railroad expansion and to supply capital to other forms of enterprise.

The book is full of good things. Chapter II, on the promotion of the early corporations, ought to be made compulsory reading for those who find the early nineteenth century so easy to describe in terms of Industrialism, High Capitalism, and other such labels.

The University of Minnesota. HERBERT HEATON.

Wilhelm von Kardorff, ein nationaler Parliamentarier im Zeitalter Bismarcks und Wilhelms II, 1828-1907. By SIEGFRIED VON KARDORFF. (Berlin: E. S. Mittler & Sohn. 1936. Pp. viii, 384. 8 M.)

IN Kardorff was epitomized a large section of the Prussian governing class in the era of the Hohenzollern Empire. Of a noble family which for two centuries had divided its allegiance between landed estates in Mecklenburg and military service in Denmark, Wilhelm von Kardorff became a Prussian of the Prussians (like Queen Louise, who had been a Mecklenburg princess) and pursued a career not as soldier but as civil servant—and parliamentarian. He studied and reveled in corps life and fought thirty-one duels at Heidelberg and Halle. At the end of the 1840's he entered the Prussian civil service, and in the 1850's he purchased large properties in Silesia. In the 1860's he added to his basic agricultural—and patriotic—interests a profitable interest in high finance and capitalistic industry, and he was soon prominent in the organization and direction of a bank, a railway, and a coal company. In 1875 he founded the Central Association of German Industrialists.

Stanchly Conservative and Lutheran, Kardorff was still more stanchly Prussian—and nationalist. Elected to the Prussian House of Representatives in 1866 and to the Reichstag of the North German Confederation in 1867, he gave wholehearted support to the foreign and domestic policies of Bismarck, and, when some of these were attacked by the ultra-Conservative leader, Ludwig von Gerlach, Kardorff left the Conservative party and helped to form the Free Conservative (subsequently known as the Reichspartei). Of this fraction he was an influential member in the Reichstag and in the

Prussian parliament from 1867 almost to the date of his death forty years later, and its president from 1881.

As a Free Conservative, and likewise as both agriculturist and industrialist, Kardorff occupied a peculiarly strategic and conciliatory position between the purely agrarian Conservatives and the urban National Liberals. In close co-operation with the latter he forwarded the Kulturkampf and contributed much to the reform of local government in Prussia; and then with the special aid of the former and of the Center party he was largely instrumental in obtaining the protective tariff legislation of 1879 and of 1902. A devoted friend and worshipful admirer of Bismarck, he was quite unhappy during the Caprivi regime and discreetly critical of both William II and Hohenlohe, and during the 1890's he was in the front rank of the agrarian opposition. In Bülow, however, he fondly perceived a sound and sensible landlord and statesman, a Bismarck *redivivus*. Incidentally, he thought highly of Carl Peters, the colonial promoter, and materially assisted his "rehabilitation".

Kardorff was not a doctrinaire, except perhaps in respect of the teachings of the American economist Henry C. Carey, on which he posited his long struggle for tariff protectionism and his inveterate but less successful fight for bimetallism. He was essentially practical after the model of aristocratic English politicians and markedly adroit in effecting parliamentary coalitions in favor of military, naval, and colonial measures and in opposition to socialism and radicalism. The Hohenzollern Empire owed its achievements and prestige not only to Bismarck but to a group of able like-minded men among whom Kardorff was far from least.

The present biography of Kardorff has been written by his son. It is excellent of its kind. It is clear and straightforward, well annotated and richly documented. It includes a large number of hitherto unpublished letters to or from Bismarck and his son Herbert, Count Arnim, Dr. Arendt, General Waldersee, and others. It contains particularly interesting and instructive chapters on the Free Conservative party, on the "calumnies" against Bismarck (and Kardorff) from 1873 to 1877, and on the economic as well as the political aspects of the movements in behalf of protectionism, agrarianism, and bimetallism.

It is pretty strictly a political and parliamentary biography. There is little about Kardorff's personal and family life or about his non-political ideas and activities. Even on the political side there is an occasional lapse or omission, which conceivably may indicate that the author has inherited some of his father's opportunism and has thought fit to apply it in the presence of the non-Bismarckian Third Reich. At any rate, there is no mention of the important anti-Polish agitation and legislation which characterized the Bismarckian and likewise the Bülow era and with which Kardorff as the intimate friend of Tiedemann must have been concerned. And there is a

wide gulf between the author's assertion (p. 155) that Kardorff was "a fundamental opponent of the parliamentary system" and the manifold evidence presented by the whole volume that the parliamentarianism of the Hohenzollern Empire was his delight, as he was its adept and ornament.

Columbia University. CARLTON J. H. HAYES.

Die auswärtige Politik Preussens, 1858-1871. Dritte Abteilung. Band IX, *Mai, 1867, bis April, 1868.* Von Dr. HERBERT MICHAELIS. [Historische Reichskommission.] Oldenburg i.O.: Gerhard Stalling. 1936. Pp. 934. 47.75 M.)

THE policy referred to by Arnold Oskar Meyer in his review article in the *Historische Zeitschrift* (CLIII, 325; *cf. Am. Hist. Rev.*, XL, 126) of not including in the succeeding volumes of this series the full text of previously printed documents was not applied to this volume. Of the 774 principal documents about 250 are easily accessible elsewhere. The new documents come chiefly from the archives of Berlin, Dresden, Munich, Karlsruhe, Stuttgart, Darmstadt, Vienna, and London. There are none from Rome or Moscow.

This volume covers a year, from the end of the London Conference, which concluded the Luxemburg crisis, to the opening of the first session of the parliament of the Zollverein, which united representatives of the South German states with those of the North German Confederation. It was a year that was relatively uneventful in European international politics. The most striking incident was Garibaldi's march on Rome, which was ended at Mentana by the *chassepots* of the returning French army of occupation.

The Luxemburg crisis was ended to the great satisfaction of King William (no. 1), but fear of a Franco-German war continued. The meeting of Napoleon III and Francis Joseph initiated the *rapprochement* of France and Austria, which led up to the Triple Alliance negotiations of 1868 and 1869. This made the cultivation of good relations with Russia a matter of special importance for Bismarck. The inability of the editor to secure access to the Russian archives leaves an important gap in our knowledge here, but there is some new material from Prussian sources on Alexander II's promise to hold Austria in check in case of a Prussian war with France (nos. 644, 678, 690, and *passim*). For the time being, the greatest danger seemed to lie in the Eastern Question. It was feared in Vienna that Russia was planning to intervene on behalf of the Christians in the Balkans and in St. Petersburg that Austria would occupy Bosnia in case of revolt in the Ottoman provinces or vassal states.

In Germany the negotiations for a South German Confederation were continued but to no avail. The question of the right of individual states, specifically, Hesse south of the Main, and Baden, to enter the North German

Confederation was raised. For the time being Bismarck had no intention of permitting this, but he refused to admit that Article IV of the Treaty of Prague was a bar against it (*cf.* pp. 47, 111, 179, and *passim*). Beust's warning against an extension of the powers of the customs parliament (no. 729) increased Bismarck's suspicions of his Austrian rival. Except in Baden the anti-Prussian parties were gaining in strength, and Bismarck was disturbed by increasing evidence of clerical opposition (*e.g.*, no. 722).

The principal minor questions on which new material is offered include internal conditions in Rumania, the Hanoverian Legion, North Schleswig, the visit of Prince Napoleon to Berlin, and that of Crown Prince Frederick William to Italy.

The conclusion of the military alliance treaties of Prussia with the South German states and the renewal of the Zollverein, including a customs parliament, foreshadowed the establishment of the German Empire but left the time and means of its completion an open question. The Hessian minister at Berlin saw in the opening of the customs parliament a peaceful portent. But the conservative Carl von Manteuffel wrote at the same time: "Was über diese Feste hinaus aus dem Zollparlament werden soll, verstehe ich nicht; ich glaube dass Bismarcks Stern, insofern derselbe an dem Norddeutschen Horizont leuchten soll, im Verbleichen begriffen ist. Auf dem Reichstage hat das Einsetzen seiner Person jungst nicht mehr ausgereicht, um die Majorität zu erreichen, auf irgendeine Donquichoterie müssen wir also gefasst sein" (no. 774 and n. 1).

The University of Minnesota. LAWRENCE D. STEEFEL.

The Cape to Cairo Dream: A Study in British Imperialism. By LOIS A. C. RAPHAEL. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, Columbia University.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1936. Pp. 514. $4.50.)

STUDENTS who have looked in vain for reliable information about the Cape-to-Cairo railway will feel grateful to Mrs. Raphael for the study she has made after careful research into all available material pertaining to that great African scheme. The story given here deals chiefly with the last twenty-five years of the nineteenth century, but it seeks to satisfy awakened curiosity by the addition of a chapter to indicate what has happened since 1900. Apart from its account of the transcontinental telegraph that a few Englishmen talked about in the late seventies, the book tells the very familiar story of England's vector of interest running north and south in Africa with the serious problems that arose at the intersections made by the transverse lines of interest representing Boer, Portuguese, German, Belgian, and French imperialism. England's "dream" of a railway from the Cape to Cairo was often a nightmare for other European powers.

England's conquest of South Africa, Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Uganda, Egypt, and the Sudan, the rivalries that occurred in Ethiopia and at Fashoda, Germany's success in blocking England in 1894 by protest against her arrangement with Belgian Congo for a right of way—all this has often been told. What is new here is the effort of Mrs. Raphael to determine the role of the Cape-to-Cairo railway in that story. The author says that she is giving the "influence of an idea". Such an influence is always difficult to trace, for the part played by ideas in determining policies must be assumed more often than it can be proved. The Cape-to-Cairo railway project never takes on the reality of other great transcontinental railways of the nineteenth century; detailed plans for it were never worked out. The idea seems to be more of a slogan for a few imperialists than anything else. The present reviewer is impressed by the number of times when the idea does not appear necessary to an intrepretation of the events here related. "The British did not pursue a definite Cape-to-Cairo policy", although "outsiders often accused them of doing so".

The book suffers from its mass of detail, which, like the sudd in the White Nile, makes progress rather slow. Carelessness has resulted in a number of typographical and other errors. The most serious criticism of the book's usefulness is the inadequacy of its six maps, which omit the location of many places to which frequent reference is made and consequently force the careful reader to search other maps most diligently if he is to follow the book's argument with understanding.

Yale University. HARRY R. RUDIN.

The Career of Theophile Delcassé. By CHARLES W. PORTER. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1936. Pp. 356. $8.50.)

THE historian of modern France is bound to feel at almost every turn the lack of adequate memoir and biographical material. Both "authorized" and "scholarly" lives (and the two are usually antithetical) are remarkably few, despite the traditional pre-eminence of the French in the field of memoir writing. All efforts to fill the gap are therefore to be welcomed in principle. The trouble, of course, comes in finding adequate material. Mr. Porter has had some conversations with Delcassé's daughter and with Camille Barrère, but he has not seen Delcassé's papers (if they still exist), nor has he had access to any documents that are not generally available. The result is that his book, while it brings together a certain amount of scattered information, adds nothing to what we already know of Delcassé's career as foreign minister. On the contrary, Mr. Porter's account of the development of policy in the crucial years from 1898 to 1905 is distinctly conventional and at times superficial. For example, there is hardly a reference to either the Boulanger or the Dreyfus crisis as either may have influenced Delcassé's attitude or position;

the discussion of Delcassé's policy in the Sudan question in 1893 is in no sense analytical; the treatment of the great Fashoda crisis avoids most of the really problematic aspects. It seems to me that the whole question of French relations with Germany is put aside rather too lightly and that the evolution of the Franco-Russian Alliance should have been more critically studied. The efforts of Muraviev to draw Delcassé into a policy of intervention against England in 1899-1900 are almost entirely glossed over, and Delcassé's possible connection with the agitation of Kramař and the Young Czechs is completely overlooked, despite the author's very appropriate stress on Delcassé's hopes of detaching Austria-Hungary from the German alliance.

Easily the most valuable and illuminating part of this study is the earlier part. Mr. Porter has, for the first time, followed out the history of Delcassé's relations with Gambetta and the story of his journalistic activity. He has shown conclusively that the basic ideas of the later foreign minister were almost all derived from the great patriot of 1870, and that long before he reached official position Delcassé had a well-rounded program of foreign policy, which he had often expounded in the *République française* or the *Paris*. It strikes me, however, that Mr. Porter gives too much importance to the influence of Delcassé the journalist. If he advocated an alliance with Russia, he was only one of many who took that line, and he was by no means one of the more important. This tendency to overrate the significance of the subject is probably an inescapable weakness of all biography. It leads Mr. Porter to ignore to a large extent the great progress that had been made toward an entente with Italy before Delcassé took over the foreign office and to lay too great stress on parliamentary utterances of the minister. In the larger sense it distorts the author's estimate of Delcassé's achievement, which nobody would want to belittle. The foreign minister was by no means at all times heroic. The Fashoda crisis was in some ways the direct result of a policy which he had himself initiated. It was based on the idea that England would respect only those who put up a bold front. But when the storm broke, Delcassé was anything but bold. He complained and he begged, he threatened and drew back, and he even went so far as to try to scare the British with the German bogeyman. The Russians left him shamelessly in the lurch, which did not deter him from running after them, just as he swallowed his pride in the hope of cultivating the friendship of England. His attitude in the early stages of the Moroccan crisis of 1905 was no more heroic. All this was what someone called the "policy of the extended cheek". It was the Delcassé policy which is not adequately considered in this volume, though on the whole the author has tried to be fair-minded and just. The book, all in all, is interestingly written and well documented. More studies of this character would serve a useful purpose.

Harvard University. WILLIAM L. LANGER.

Documents diplomatiques français, 1871-1914. Série 3 (1911-1914), tome X, *17 mars-23 juillet, 1914;* XI, *24 juillet-4 août, 1914.* [Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Commission de publication des Documents relatifs aux origines de la Guerre de 1914.] (Paris: Imprimerie nationale. 1936. Pp. xxxvi, 832; lii, 646. 60 frs. each.)

PROFESSOR Renouvin and his coeditors are to be congratulated on these two volumes, which complete the third series of the French documents on the origins of the War. They have been meticulous in their search for all possible material bearing on the crisis of July, 1914. Not only papers from the ministry of foreign affairs but also from the ministries of war and marine and from the private collections of French diplomats and other officials have been painstakingly ransacked and, if relevant, printed. One gets the impression of complete accuracy, frankness, and reliability.

What new revelations do these volumes bring? None of fundamental importance. The general picture is not much changed. But certain small gaps in the mosaic can now be filled in. Other gaps still remain, such as the exact nature of the conversations at St. Petersburg during President Poincaré's visit and the role of the French ambassador, M. Paléologue, during the ensuing days.

Volume X is largely occupied with the continued efforts to liquidate the consequences of the Balkan Wars: the Turco-Greek conflict over the Aegean Islands and the expulsion of Greeks from Asia Minor, which seemed to threaten war had not the whole scene shifted as a result of the Sarajevo assassination, the Serbian demands for the Oriental Railway, the rumors of an impending union of Serbia and Montenegro, the boundaries of Albania, and the pitiable difficulties of Prince William of Wied. There is also much on the Franco-German accord in regard to Asia Minor railways and the steps toward a settlement of the Bagdad Railway problem and on French and Belgian fears of German intrigues in regard to the Portuguese colonies and the Belgian Congo. On the two main events of high diplomacy—the visits of George V and Sir Edward Grey to Paris and President Poincaré and Viviani to St. Petersburg—there is little that is materially new and important. It is, however, interesting to find the Russian ambassador in London taking unusual precautions to prevent any "leak" in regard to the negotiations for an Anglo-Russian naval convention when in fact, as has long been well known, one of his own subordinates, Siebert, was systematically betraying the whole affair to the Germans, so that hints of the truth soon appeared mystifyingly in the *Berliner Tageblatt* (recently detailed by Theodor Wolff in *The Eve of 1914*, pp. xi, 241, 410).

Students of finance capitalism will be interested to read the long complaint against Germany's domination of Italy's economic life through the tentacles of the Banca commerciale (X, 92), the figures of Russian deposits abroad and of French capital in Belgium (X, 88, 337), of the rival activities

of Krupp and Creusot in the Balkans (X, 62, 442), and of numerous negotiations for loans to Turkey and the Balkan states.

Contrary to what one might expect, the dividing date between Volumes X and XI is not the archduke's assassination (June 28) but the presentation of the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia (July 23). This is because the editors found that for three weeks after the Sarajevo tragedy the diplomatic atmosphere remained much the same. To be sure, this event, so terrible in its consequences, added another worry to the Balkan situation, but it was not until after the Austrian ultimatum that the danger of war began to overshadow all other questions. The dispatches from Belgrade for the three months prior to the archduke's murder give an unusually full and reliable account of the Black Hand militarist opposition to Pashitch, including long excerpts from Serbian press fulminations against Austria. But for the momentous sultry days from July 14 to 25 the French government received not a single word from its minister in Belgrade. This seems amazing—until the editors explain that the French minister was sick and his successor had not arrived. From Cetinje, however, came the significant item, sent on July 20 but not received in Paris until August 7, that one of Princip's accomplices, Mehmedbasitch, had been arrested at the request of the Austrian authorities, but "a subordinate official took the intelligent initiative of effecting the escape of the prisoner and no one knows at the moment where he has fled to. . . . The Minister of Foreign Affairs declared to me on his honor that the Montenegrin Government had nothing to do with the escape. In any case I do not believe that the guilty official will see his future advancement impeded by the initiative which he took in this matter" (X, 537).

The biggest revelation in Volume XI is the evidence of the large extent to which documents were "doctored" in the famous *French Yellow Book* of 1914. The compiler of this propagandist publication, working more at leisure than the editors of the German, English, and Russian "color books", saw fit, aside from unimportant changes of wording, to alter nearly half the documents—some 70 out of 159—in order to change the meaning or implication in more or less important ways. Telegrams of the highest importance, such as Paléologue's reports of July 25 and 26 concerning Russia's measures preparatory to war (XI, 50, 89), were omitted completely. In many cases inconvenient sentences and paragraphs were deleted before the mutilated document was published in the *Yellow Book*. In other cases sentences and paragraphs made up out of whole cloth were inserted. Dates were changed and the sequence of documents altered. Space forbids any enumeration of these astounding alterations. The main purposes at which they evidently aimed were, on the one hand, to conceal Russia's hasty military measures, France's suspicions of Belgium and Italy, and her frantic efforts to get an early promise of aid from England; and, on the other hand, to make it appear that Austrian general mobilization (July 31) was the cause of Russian

general mobilization (July 30), that Germany knew beforehand of the ultimatum to Serbia, that Austria toward the end of the crisis was ready to make concessions, and that Germany, in the words of the *Yellow Book*, no. 114, "has sought the humiliation of Russia, the disintegration of the Triple Entente, and, if these results cannot be obtained, war". Such were some of the *Yellow Book's* contributions to the legends of "war guilt".

Of the leading French diplomats, M. Jules Cambon at Berlin seems to stand forth as perhaps the wisest and most discerning—firm, anxious for peace, but constantly warning his government that it must be ready to fight; for evidences of his insight see especially nos. 29, 339, 436, 521, 602.

His brother, Paul, in London, is notable for the ingenuity and persistence with which he left no stone unturned to bring Grey to a decision to support France before France should take the irrevocable step of ordering general mobilization (the so-called 10-kilometer withdrawal, lists of German frontier aggressions, England's "error of 1870", and the suggestions for influencing the British press). Grey's proposal for a four-power mediation between Vienna and St. Petersburg, successfully thwarted by him as far as France was concerned (XI, 23, 38, 101) but accepted in Berlin and approved by Jules Cambon (XI, 108, 203), was also opposed by Paléologue at St. Petersburg (XI, 248).

M. Paléologue is a more enigmatic figure. He was astonishingly slow in sending off his telegrams—many of them are fifteen, twenty, or more hours after the events. He fails to comment on the wide discrepancy between Sazonov's and Sukhomlinov's accounts of Russia's warlike decisions on July 25 (XI, 50, 89) and reports nothing on the very important Russian general mobilization order and its cancellation on July 29 (*cf.* XI, 283, 342, 359, 432, 794). There are many inaccuracies and other omissions of important events in St. Petersburg as we now know them. How far may his failure to keep his government at Paris promptly and fully informed have been owing to weariness from the strenuous celebrations during Poincaré's visit, how far to the fact that he may have been kept somewhat in the dark by Sazonov, how far to the possibility that he may have been fairly cognizant of Russia's doings and co-operated with Sazonov in what virtually resulted in facing France with serious *faits accomplis?* It is difficult to say with certainty. Would the Paris government, if more promptly and fully informed, have made more prompt and effective efforts to restrain Russia? Again, it is difficult to say.

Harvard University. SIDNEY B. FAY.

Grey of Fallodon: The Life and Letters of Sir Edward Grey, afterwards Viscount Grey of Fallodon. By GEORGE MACAULAY TREVELYAN. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1937. Pp. xiii, 447. $3.75.)

PROFESSOR Trevelyan has solved with unusual success the fundamental problem of the biographer—the combination of a personal narrative with a

record and analysis of achievement. The construction is masterly and the language admirably chosen. The whole atmosphere of the book is attuned to the character of its subject. It presents in the simplest possible way an unforgettable picture of a statesman whose personal qualities are beyond dispute —even when his statesmanship is questioned. The author of *The Charm of Birds* has found a biographer who has himself the art of catching the echoes of the countryside. And the life and work of this "great Englishman" stand out in the pages of the biography against a setting of the scenes and sounds of the English lanes and river banks which were the source of his serenity.

The biography of a statesman whose work is so close to our own time, and above all whose term of office fell in a period of great crisis, is bound to be judged largely by its contribution to the study of his policy. Here there is both gain and loss in the fact that no era in foreign affairs is so fully documented. It is far easier than it might have been to give a reasoned judgment; it is far more difficult than it might have been to make striking revelations. Professor Trevelyan has indeed had access to both private and official papers and has printed largely from them. The private letters in the collection of the Grey MSS. at the British Foreign Office have, however, already been used freely by Dr. Gooch and Professor Temperley in *British Documents on the Origins of the War,* and many of those quoted by Professor Trevelyan have already been published in this series, while a few written in the last years of peace are mentioned as about to appear in the final volume—including the important letter from King George V of December 8, 1912, which records his warning message to Emperor William (p. 261). The papers of the war years are in the main new, since only a few appeared in Lord Grey's *Twenty-Five Years;* there are, in particular, some important documents of 1914-16 referring to Grey's relations with the United States and the question of the freedom of the seas (pp. 355-65). Throughout the book there are interesting side lights from more personal sources—letters to Lady Grey and to private friends. In a letter to Lady Grey, for example, on January 16, 1906, there is a mention of the interview with M. Paul Cambon of the fifteenth, the first since M. Cambon had "put the great question" to him: "I had another talk with Cambon yesterday and feel just a little as if I was seeing my way and had my hand on things." And again on February 1: "I had tremendous difficult tasks and work yesterday . . . I do not know that I did well but I did honestly" (p. 117). These are reflections which could hardly be looked for except in personal correspondence; they show Grey's mind at work when he was formulating the policy described in his private letter of January 15 to Sir Francis Bertie (printed in Gooch and Temperley, III, 177-8) and in the long dispatch of the thirty-first (printed both there, pp. 180-2, and in *Twenty-Five Years,* I, 78-81). Professor Trevelyan says in his preface that "so far as possible" he has "printed letters that have not yet appeared in *Twenty-Five Years* or in Gooch & Temperley" (p. viii). In fact

he has done more than this. For he has reprinted freely those which he found essential (*e.g.*, the dispatch of January 31 cited above) and has supplemented them by extracts from personal and private correspondence. The serious student of foreign affairs must indeed seek much of his material elsewhere and will turn to this work rather for an interpretation of outlook than for new facts, but for the wider circle of readers Professor Trevelyan has provided an intelligible selection of letters, which show the main points of policy.

The publication of this book is, indeed, an important step forward in the direction of an understanding of British policy in the much disputed period before the war and at its outbreak. The final word—if it is ever spoken—will not come for many years. The most that can be asked at the present time is that the interpretation should be reasonable and based on an impartial study of the materials. Professor Trevelyan in summing up Grey's policy says that "His principal deficiency as a Foreign Minister was, in my view, that he took no interest in military operations" (p. 320). Many harder things have been said of the statesman who more than anyone else determined British policy in the prewar period. Professor Trevelyan is perhaps too much concerned with defending him against them. The charge of "encirclement", born of the feverish controversies of war, is less likely to trouble those who try to interpret Grey's policy in future generations, while the criticism that he left the Foreign Office for week ends in the country can safely be left for reply to Grey's own words at Christmas, 1911: "I have just succeeded in getting to Fallodon and am alone here for a few days. I like to be alone after a strenuous time. I can rest and sleep when I please and think of past years. There is also a good deal of work every day sent here from the F.O. My squirrels come on to my writing table and take nuts from my hand as if I had never been away" (p. 52).

The attention of critics is bound to be attracted primarily to the discussion of the principles of Grey's policy. Professor Trevelyan, in referring to Lord Rosebery's views on the Anglo-French entente, says that "the Entente policy was based on the opposite idea, that neither we nor France were strong enough to go on quarrelling in the presence of the lord of four million soldiers and the second navy in the world" (p. 95); and he quotes Mr. Winston Churchill as saying that "Grey definitely accepted the task of resisting the German power, and of making England play a decisive part in that" (p. 247). Extracts from Grey's own letters suggest, however, a slightly different interpretation. In December, 1906, he wrote to Mr. Roosevelt: "Now, a word as to our own policy. It is not anti-German. But it must be independent of Germany" (p. 131); and again, in 1913 to Sir Rennell Rodd: "If our Fleet was not superior to the German Fleet, our very independence would depend on Germany's goodwill" (p. 249). Moreover, Prince Lichnowsky is quoted to the effect that "England hoped to divert the German devel-

opment of strength from the North Sea and Western Europe to the Ocean and to Africa" (p. 272). These sentences must of course be studied in their proper setting; but they must be studied also in the light of the long history of Britain's co-operation, in the era of Salisbury, with the powers of the Triple Alliance. Grey inherited from his predecessors a great deal more than the policy of the Anglo-French entente and the Anglo-Japanese Alliance and the uneasy arrangement with Germany of 1898 over the Portuguese colonial question. The workings of British policy in the prewar era form to a great extent one story, and it is only when this period has been fully studied in all its parts that a verdict can be given on the last critical eight years. Then discussion may well fasten on other points than the already familiar question of whether Grey's policy was or was not "anti-German": for example, on the degree to which he was prepared to take the lead in Europe in 1913-14, when the Balkan crisis was over and the success of "the method of a conference" established, and when Britain and Germany were coming to an understanding over the Portuguese Treaty and the Bagdad Railway.

Professor Trevelyan makes many interesting contributions to the study of the period, and the student will find much to stimulate him in quotation and comment bearing, for example, on such questions as Grey's views on the guarantee to Belgium or the observance of treaties. But the book has profited immensely by the author's restraint in not attempting to solve all the problems involved in a detailed study. He has contented himself with fulfilling admirably the task for which he is peculiarly fitted—that of recording, while men's memories are still fresh, the personality and the life of a statesman whose mind and temper are so strikingly revealed in his own words of 1906: "I do not know that I did well but I did honestly".

University of London. LILLIAN M. PENSON.

War Memoirs of David Lloyd George. Volume VI, *1918*. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 1937. Pp. xii, 406. $3.00.)

"IN the long run, a war can only be won in the political sphere. It was the failure to recognize this profound historic truth that brought us down . . . the military and naval authorities always had the decisive word". So Count Bernstorff in his memoirs! A perfect tribute to the war technique of David Lloyd George: the civilian, the politician, marshaling the armed forces of empire and the morale of a world alliance; the "Little Man" riding the whirlwind, battling the while generals and admirals lest their "great power", exercised with limited vision, lead finally to exhaustion and defeat. Six volumes of memoirs recount the struggle in epic terms; the man of action has become contemplative for his own and for subsequent generations. The memoirs may be factually defective, inadequate as documentary records, but as interpretation and commentary they are incomparable; their vitality, their spirit endures. Throughout, the style is strong; each volume

has passages of powerful writing; the horizon is rarely limited or local; the humanity of the author is never lost in the exaltedness of an imperial prime minister.

Your reviewer does not entirely agree with the view that these memoirs are marred by the author's vindictiveness or vainglorious complacency. He looks upon them as the product of a very resourceful mind embodied in an amazingly vigorous personality, of a genius combining to unusual degree the power of thought and action, completely obsessed with the bigness and importance of a fateful task. The errors, the ignorance, the clever tricks, the facile changes are counterbalanced by singleness of purpose and power of achievement. An earlier generation would never have doubted that Lloyd George was "raised up" to win the war. It is seldom that men of comparable stature and temperament leave posterity such a voluminous hostage.

The manner of the telling is contentious. Lloyd George, able strategist that he is, has borrowed a maxim from the realm of military dogma, which he so often deprecated: the best defense is a vigorous and sustained offensive. Like Foch, he attacks. His thesis is that the civilians won the war in spite of the generals. To the end of the last volume he remains unrepentant of the sin of political meddling in the mysteries of the military craft and boldly asserts that the civilians practiced "too much caution in exerting their authority over the generals". Military command is concentrated power. "Great Power is like alcohol. It exhilarates most men beyond the bounds of reality . . . in all cases it poisons judgment". War is not an exact science, he contends, it is "an art, proficiency in which depends more on experience than on study, and more on natural aptitude and judgment than on either". Yet judgment has been infrequently conspicuous among the qualities which have advanced generals to high command. Seniority, Society, and Deportment leave Brains a poor fourth among causes of military promotion. In the Dominion forces alone did civilians rise to the command of armies: Currie of Canada and Monash of Australia—"Monash, the most resourceful general in the whole of the British army".

Despite his concern with the strategic conduct of the war, Lloyd George never lost the statesman's grasp of the immense whole. His memoirs bear testimony to his intense awareness of war's multifarious aspects. He is concious of the process of daily living for the noncombatants, of the vital importance of production and distribution. If he worries about the inadequacy of G.H.Q., he is always solicitously concerned for the common soldier in the trenches. Most impressive, and characteristic, is the enthusiasm with which, in chapter VII of the sixth volume, he glories in a "Great Educational Reform" planned "when the war was reaching its deafening climax". He is thrilled that his country could hear H. A. L. Fisher's speeches for this reform during the crashes of 1918. "While the British legions were reeling back

in defeat and confusion" the House of Commons debated and passed "clause by clause this monumental enactment".

This final volume completes the tale of the establishment of the unified command and sketches the controversy raised by General Maurice, director of operations, as to whether Lloyd George starved the army of men. It briefly narrates the operations which led to the armistice, stressing the contribution of the "side-shows", Turkey and the Balkans, to the eventual collapse of German resistance. A chapter pays tribute to the loyalty and aid given by all portions of the empire in carrying on the war. Here also Lloyd George summarizes his opinions on the "Functions of Governments and Soldiers respectively in a War" and devotes considerable space to a recapitulation of the reasons for his lack of confidence in the generalship of Field Marshal Haig. As against the evidence so far presented from Haig's own diaries and from military literature, both official and unofficial, Lloyd George's contentions would seem to be justified. His forthright criticism of a national military hero violates, perhaps, traditional good form, but it is not rancorous, and it is candid.

Highly interesting are Lloyd George's final reflections on the war as a whole. The time for definitive judgments has probably not arrived, but from what contemporary could come more valid generalizations? He himself played a longer, and possibly more important, role than any other single human being. He believes that the war could have been averted, but once started it could not have been terminated by negotiation. But for the blunders and mistakes of the Allies, they might have triumphed in two instead of four years. Thanks equally to the virtual military dictatorship in Germany and its strategic errors, and to Allied superiority in men and resources, victory crowned the cause which Lloyd George believes to have been right. "But let all who trust Justice to the arbitrament of War bear in mind that the issue may depend not on the righteousness of the quarrel, but on the craft of the litigants. It is the teaching of history, and this war enforces the lesson".

Amherst College. LAURENCE B. PACKARD.

Cabinet Government. By W. IVOR JENNINGS. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1936. Pp. xii, 484. $5.50.)

THIS is the most important work on the modern British cabinet system that has been published. The author's object is to describe cabinet government as it existed in 1935, but in order to do this intelligibly he draws heavily upon many phases of British constitutional history during the last hundred years; he seldom finds it necessary to go back of 1832. His concern is with the political part of administration, not with the administrative system as such. He devotes a chapter to "The Administration", but it is admittedly only a general survey, and an appendix on "The British Ad-

ministrative System" does not pretend to be more than a brief, descriptive catalogue of the executive departments. The civil service lies beyond his purview. He deals with parliament only as "a forum for the criticism of the Government" and with party only as "a means by which a Government achieves power". In addition to wide reading in the relevant sources and secondary literature he had the advantage of "casual conversations with persons possessing special knowledge". His attempt to "exclude all elements of personal bias" has been remarkably successful, though he does not hesitate to speak with disapproval of behavior which he deems unconstitutional. A very useful feature of the book is an appendix which lists all the governments that have held office during the hundred years 1835-1935 and gives in each case a brief statement of the circumstances under which the government was formed and under which it came to an end.

British cabinet government, Dr. Jennings reminds us, rests on conventions, not on laws, though he regards the distinction between the two as technical rather than vital. He considers carefully the question of when precedents create conventions and the question of what precedents are now to be considered as having value. "Practices turn into conventions and precedents create rules", he concludes, "because they are consistent with and are implied in the principles of the Constitution". The Reform Act of 1832 fundamentally altered the nature of the constitution, and precedents from earlier periods, so far as they depend upon the unreformed system, are regarded by the author as worthless. The essential principle of the modern constitution is that it is democratic. If Queen Victoria's attitude toward Gladstone and the Liberal party after 1880 was unconstitutional, and Dr. Jennings so considers it, this was not entirely owing to her personal antipathy to Mr. Gladstone. It was partly because she never grasped the full implications of the democratization of the constitution that had come about during her lifetime. As Joseph Chamberlain expressed it in his Radical days, she was, after all, the granddaughter of George III.

The choice of a prime minister, the formation of a government, the relations between departments, treasury control, the position and powers of the prime minister, the cabinet, constitutional monarchy, the so-called "personal prerogatives" of the sovereign, patronage and honors—these are the more important of the topics of which the author treats, and on all of them he has much that is important to say. Many facts are presented that were unknown to the public till long after they had occurred. This is notably the case in the chapter on constitutional monarchy, which is based mainly on published correspondence, memoirs, and biographical and autobiographical writings. Bagehot remarked in his *English Constitution* that though the House of Commons had inquired into most things, it had never had a committee on the queen, that there was no "blue book" to tell what she did. On the basis of careful investigation Dr. Jennings has produced in this

chapter not a blue book but a most informing account of the role of the sovereign in the modern cabinet system of government. To some readers the author's lack of courtliness in dealing with royalty will be refreshing; to others, no doubt, it will seem indecorous.

In a treatise as important in substance as this it is regrettable that the author did not take greater pains to rise to the height of his argument. He can, upon occasion, clinch an exposition with an apt aphorism, but too often his exposition is defective. His writing has little of that "order and movement" which Buffon emphasized as the essence of the genius of style; it is even lacking, sometimes, in the rudimentary virtues of precision, consistency, and clarity—to the distraction and confusion of the reader. An occasional incorrect statement does not greatly matter. It is disconcerting, however, to be told on one page that Lord Salisbury's evidence regarding Disraeli as a prime minister is "important" and on the next that the instances given by Salisbury in support of his opinion do not justify it (pp. 143-4). When an attentive reader is informed that George V played a part in the settlement of the Irish question, and the reason given for this opinion is that the speech from the throne on the opening of the parliament of Northern Ireland, "which was drafted by Mr. Lloyd George", was "the first step towards the negotiations between the British and Irish leaders" (p. 290), he is likely to reread the passage to discover what evidence of the king's personal initiative has escaped him, only to discover that the author has nodded. It is disturbing to be told that the prime minister is usually first lord of the treasury "partly because he would not otherwise possess an office under the Crown and be able to draw a salary" (p. 154), and, on the next page, that Mr. MacDonald in 1924 was both first lord and foreign secretary. As one of the respects in which the threat to create peers in 1911 *differed* from that in 1832 Dr. Jennings gives an instance of *similarity* between the two (p. 336). There is an inverse relationship between the labor of a writer and that of his readers. Dr. Jennings has given us much, but if he had taken greater pains in the giving, he would have promoted our comfort and increased our gratitude.

Columbia University. R. L. Schuyler.

The Earth Goddess: A Study of Native Farming on the West African Coast. By G. Howard Jones, Director of the Mycological Section, Ministry of Agriculture, Egypt, formerly Mycologist, Department of Agriculture, Nigeria. [Royal Empire Society Imperial Studies.] (New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1936. Pp. vii, 207. $5.00.)

This admirable volume describes the new "trusteeship" policy followed by the British in the administration of their African colonies where they are attempting to integrate the "Westernization" necessary for progress in our modern world with the indigenous culture patterns of the African

natives. Mr. Howard Jones is much more than the agricultural expert. He is the philosophical agronomist who sees his subject in its relation to the religious, social, and political life of the African. While he has much to suggest in the way of improvement of the agricultural practice and marketing of the West African natives, he is always sensitive to the far-reaching changes in the whole life of the people that improved agricultural methods would bring in its train.

After some very interesting remarks about the cult of Ala, the Earth Goddess, made in order to support his dictum that "it is impossible to understand West Coast agriculture fully in its present state without some appreciation of the religious beliefs that are associated with it", and after giving the history necessary for a proper understanding of the present position, Mr. Jones develops three themes in his "fugue": the scientific, the economic, and especially the social aspects of agriculture in West Africa.

In his careful study as to what system of land usage is best for West Africa in view of the land laws that obtain there, which he wisely does not wish to alter, Mr. Jones examines in turn the plantation, "metayer" (share cropper), and small grower systems, and rightly decides that the last named is best, provided that the small grower can make use of co-operatives for the purchase of his implements and the disposal of his products. This naturally leads to a historical study of co-operatives in England, Germany, Denmark, and India, and he sees the impossibility of introducing any system of co-operatives on the West Coast without a great deal of guidance and even shepherding on the part of the government.

Any development in agriculture involves improvement in education, and Mr. Jones has a good deal to say about the value of tribal education and the inadequacy of the "book" education which is now so firmly rooted in some parts of West Africa. One might wonder if he would despise agricultural education in schools so much, or pin his faith on the "nature study" approach to agriculture so completely, if he had seen the remarkable agricultural education given in some of the better Negro and Indian secondary schools in this country.

This important volume, which has some very good illustrations, a short annotated bibliography, and an index, is well worthy of the series in which it is included.

Yale University. CHARLES T. LORAM.

FAR EASTERN HISTORY

Chung-Kuo K'ao-shih Chih-tu Shih. By TENG SSU-YÜ. (Nanking: K'ao-Hsüan Wei-Yüan-Hui. 1936. Pp. 10+2+4+2+436. $1.50, Chinese.)

THE examination system of China, whereby men of talent in the empire were democratically selected for the highest positions in the government, was

the keystone in the arch of the *ancien régime*. The abolition of that system in 1905 was a prime cause of the collapse of the old society and the chaos which has followed. This led to a revival of the practice of appointment to office largely through recommendation, opening the door once again to favoritism, nepotism, the consequent drift toward the concentration of power around dominant personalities, and the revival of a semi-feudal society which characterizes the contemporary scene in China.

The decision to abandon the examination system was made under the empire by reforming officials, who gave as their ostensible reason the necessity of strengthening the state through the development of a modern educational system, with emphasis on science and the study of contemporary social and political problems. The old system, with its emphasis on classical learning, was held to be the most serious obstacle to this development. True enough, but why no effort was made to preserve the good features of the system and its fundamental democratic principles while changing the content of the examinations is one of the outstanding paradoxes of contemporary Chinese history.

That contemporary Chinese government leaders realize the mistake of the past is evidenced in their efforts to restore essential features of the former examination system and for that purpose to foster an investigation of it. The committee in charge of the examinations under the Examination Yuan, one of the five principal divisions of the Nanking government, has sponsored the publication of the present historical study of the examination system, which was made by a brilliant young Chinese scholar, well trained in the critical approach to historical sources. It is a thoroughly sound piece of work, comprehensive in scope and based upon an investigation of all pertinent sources. The author traces the development of the system from the beginning of the practice of recommending men of talent in the Han dynasty (206 B. C.-221 A. D.) to the formulation of examinations to replace that practice in the Sui dynasty (590-618) and the full elaboration of the system in the T'ang (618-906). The author then goes on to trace the changes made in the system through successive dynasties to the time of its abolition. He concludes his study with chapters in which he discusses the effects of the system on government, on culture in general, and on society. The two supplements comprise a table setting forth in brief the historical developments of the system and an extensive bibliography of over two hundred items on the subject.

Columbia University. C. H. PEAKE.

The Political Doctrines of Sun Yat-Sen: An Exposition of the "San Min Chu I". By PAUL MYRON ANTHONY LINEBARGER. [The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1937. Pp. xiv, 278. $2.75.)

THE latest of the monographs on Sun Yat-sen, by Mr. Linebarger, is a

good example of patient and systematic research. In the brief preface by Arthur N. Holcombe, the veteran student of China, the reader is told that the book "not only renders obsolete all previous volumes in Western languages on modern Chinese political philosophy, but also makes available for the political scientists and politicians of the West the best political thought of the East on the fundamental problems of Western politics". The book, however, is essentially, as its title implies, an exposition of the sixteen lectures on nationalism, democracy, and socialism delivered by Sun Yat-sen in 1924 and not of modern Chinese political philosophy as such.

Since the political thought of Sun Yat-sen is so largely a subject of controversy in present-day politics, any work on the subject almost necessarily reflects the author's own views. In this case the author fortunately commands qualifications which must give his book an appeal to many readers. He is a son of Judge Linebarger, legal adviser to the National Government of China, who knew Sun Yat-sen intimately, and thus brings to his task an unusual familiarity with the statesman whose political thought he has undertaken to analyze.

To most students of Far Eastern history Sun Yat-sen is known chiefly as a stanch advocate of Western nationalism and an active promoter of the introduction of Western ideas into China. The author points out throughout his work that Sun Yat-sen advocated not Western nationalism but an ideology based on ancient Chinese philosophies. Chapter 1, in the nature of an introduction, deals briefly with the Confucian system, on which Sun Yat-sen desired to base his political thought. The author states that the two principles of Confucianism, *jen* (social-mindedness) and *li* (ceremonies), played an important part in firmly convincing Sun Yat-sen of the necessity of basing his system on the Confucian classics but omits a third of undoubted importance in Confucian thought—*i* (the principle of loyalty). He then, in three of the chapters that follow, traces the theory of nationalism, democracy, and *min sheng,* or socialism. In the last three chapters his concern is with an exposition of the programs of these three principles.

The reviewer finds it difficult to see the extent of the influence of early Confucianism on Sun Yat-sen's political ideas which the author undertakes to describe. It may be added that it is rather characteristic of Chinese political thinkers and statesmen to trace their thought to ancient precedents or even to seem to be applying ancient methods when a different occasion arises. In this book very slight consideration is given to contemporary Russian thought, although the author admits that such influence existed. A selection of material such as that which he has made is always likely to result in over-emphasis of one aspect.

Mr. Linebarger, like practically all of those in this country who write on Chinese political thought, is unable to read the Chinese sources. The Chinese point of view obtained directly from Chinese books is worth having and in

this case would have rendered the assertions of the author more authoritative.

The book is somewhat marred by errors which a "historian" would have avoided. Remarkable chronology appears in the statement (p. 243) that the Emperor Tao Kuang wrote to George III. The spelling of Chinese proper names is not wholly consistent.

The University of Michigan. JOHN W. STANTON.

The Far Eastern Crisis: Recollections and Observations. By HENRY L. STIMSON, Secretary of State, 1929-1933. [Council on Foreign Relations.] (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1936. Pp. xii, 293. $3.75.)

MR. Stimson's review of United States Far Eastern policy during the crucial period of his administration, 1929-1933, stands among the two or three more important books on this country's involvement with the Orient. In view of the continued crisis in the Far East and in view of the universal desire of Americans to formulate policies which will keep them out of war, the value of the analysis which Mr. Stimson has presented to the public can hardly be over-estimated.

In applying the broad principles of American foreign policy to certain regions such special conditions and traditions have developed that the policies themselves have taken on very definite regional characteristics. Certainly this is true with respect to our foreign policy towards the Far East, a conspicuous characteristic of which is that we exert more initiative, more leadership and aggressive activity towards Far Eastern problems than we do towards European ones—this in spite of the relatively small commercial stake that is ours in the Orient.

Mr. Stimson describes two main purposes of the American government during the Manchurian crisis (p. 233):

> First: The purpose of preserving our future relations with China by adequately fulfilling our obligations to that country under enlightened treaties heretofore entered into by our government.
>
> Second: The purpose of preserving from destruction the foundations of a system of cooperative action for the preservation of peace which had been established under certain post-war multilateral treaties, to two of which we were parties.

The first of these rests, in Mr. Stimson's words, on the fact that "several European powers have far larger commercial and territorial interests in China than we, but geographically they are remote; we are adjacent. They are in a sense absentee landlords; we, a neighbor" (p. 234). By simple geographical measure, however, China surely is more distant from us than the countries of Europe, and as the author admits, the Far East is commercially much less important to us than is Europe. The strength of his argument, then, must rest entirely on the special feelings towards China on the

part of Americans and special traditions of policy towards the Far East which have developed during our century and a half of contact.

With respect to the second purpose of the American government during the Manchurian crisis, it is also evident that the desire to preserve from destruction postwar foundations for peace might apply equally all over the world. Again, however, the reasons why we assume greater responsibility for the postwar treaty system in the Far East than in Europe seem to lie in the special relations to the Orient which we have developed.

The body of Mr. Stimson's volume consists of an exposition and analysis of what the American government did, first, until about December 11, 1931, to try to give free play to forces in Japan so that civilians could recapture the Tokyo government, and, secondly, when Japanese actions completely disillusioned us as to that possibility, to bring world pressure, in a moral, political, and if possible economic sense, to bear on the aggressor.

Very full attention is given to the two great problems of United States co-operation with the foreign offices of other countries concerned in the dispute: first, co-operation with the League of Nations, of which we were not a member, and second, co-operation with London. The relations of our Department of State with the British Foreign Office during these months is particularly enlightening, first, because the complete breakdown of Anglo-American co-operation destroyed the unity of purpose of our two countries which in Mr. Stimson's mind was one of the most important possible sanctions to be applied against Japan, and secondly, because the mutual lack of confidence between Washington and London created on that occasion seems to be preventing stern action on the part of the Anglo-Saxon countries during the present renewal of major hostilities between China and Japan.

FREDERICK V. FIELD.

American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations.

AMERICAN HISTORY

Documents from Early Peru: The Pizarros and the Almagros, 1531-1578. [The Harkness Collection in the Library of Congress.] (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1936. Pp. xi, 253. $3.25.)

IN the present volume Miss Stella Clemence successfully continues the work so ably begun by her in the *Calendar of Spanish Manuscripts concerning Peru, 1531-1651* (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVIII, 564). Once more, therefore, students of Hispanic-American history are enabled to understand the great importance of Mr. Edward S. Harkness's gift of Spanish manuscripts to the Library of Congress.

This second volume is not, as its predecessor was, a calendar. It is a collection of forty-eight documents of which the first forty-six date from April 24, 1531, to August 31, 1545, thus covering the initial and crucial

phase of the Spanish conquest of Peru. The last two date from 1575 and 1578 respectively. With admirable care Miss Clemence has transcribed this great series of manuscripts and with praiseworthy skill has translated each item in turn.

All the Pizarros, with the exception of Juan Pizarro, are represented by documents in this series. The reason for Juan's absence is that he, being almost entirely a man of action, produced no legal papers during his short life, which was terminated by a valiant death in 1536. The papers here presented are nearly all business documents, many of them having to do with encomiendas and other forms of property. They throw a clear light upon this aspect of the commencement of Spanish power in Peru. Two documents are by women, widows of conquerors, who had been deprived of Indians formerly granted to their husbands.

Diego de Almagro and his son are likewise represented in the series. The wrongs which they sustained were great and are vividly shown forth here. Even more important are the documents in which the Audiencia of Los Reyes (Lima) appointed Gonzalo Pizarro as governor of Peru (October 23, 1544) and those in which Gonzalo instructed his campmaster, Francisco de Carvajal, to establish his sway in the land, all in the name of the king whose authority he was violently resisting.

Turmoil and contention were the keynotes of life in Peru in those days. Study of these splendidly translated and edited source materials will, however, show students of the period the causes and effects involved and so will reveal the rational basis which underlay the confusion of the time. We are shown the whole gamut of emotion felt by the Spaniards in Peru, their desire for wealth, their thirst for power, their bitter resentment of what they held to be injustice. In spite of an immense verbosity the language of the documents is both vigorous and vivid. Thanks to Miss Clemence's ability as a translator and as an editor the full flavor of the originals is preserved in the translation and notes. The usefulness of the volume as a work of reference is greatly enhanced by the very full index. In it appear the names of a large proportion of the men and women who lived and wrought in Peru at the time of the conquest and in the years following upon it.

Pomfret, Connecticut. PHILIP AINSWORTH MEANS.

William Penn: His Own Account of the Lenni Lenape or Delaware Indians, 1683. By ALBERT COOK MYERS. (Moylan, Pennsylvania: privately printed. 1937. Pp. 107.)

MR. Myers is an authority on the history of the Quaker colonies and the manners and customs of their Indian population. He has spent twenty-five years in preparing the definitive edition of the writings of William Penn and has edited and published *Sally Wister's Journal* (1902), *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania, West New Jersey, and Delaware, 1630-1707* (1912), *The Boy George Washington, aged 16: His Own Account of the Iroquois Indian*

Dance, 1748 (1932), and *Records of the Court of New Castle on Delaware, 1681-1699* (1935).

This account of the Indians is included in a general description of Pennsylvania, dated August 16 (o.s.), 1683, which was first published in London with the title *A Letter from William Penn, Proprietary and Governor of Pennsylvania in America to the Committee of the Free Society of Traders*. There were four editions in 1683, and it was translated and issued in Dutch, German, and French in 1684. Penn kept the original draft of the part of the *Letter* relating to the Indians, which is now in the possession of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Mr. Myers's text is based on a collation of this document with the early printed editions. The printed versions contain two paragraphs which are not in the draft, and there are a few other minor differences. As the manuscript sent to England has disappeared, it is impossible to say whether the changes were made by Penn or by some one else. This is an interesting problem because one of the additions is the famous paragraph in which the author expresses his belief that the Indians are descended from the ten lost tribes of Israel. It is also interesting to note that one of the earliest references to Tammany occurs in the *Letter* and that his name, spelled in a variety of ways, appears in Indian deeds and official documents for the period from 1683 to 1697. He was a chief of the Unami group of the Lenni Lenape, who lived in the Bucks County section of Pennsylvania.

There is an appendix containing other material relating to the Indians. The earliest known land sale of the Lenni Lenape to Penn, dated April 12 (o.s.), 1682, a "Letter of Pennsylvania Indians to the King of England Commending their Friend William Penn", 1701, and several other valuable documents are here printed for the first time. Penn's description of the sweat bath of the Indian chief Tenoughan is reproduced together with the more elaborate version given by John Oldmixon in his *British Empire of America*. There are about thirty illustrations, including historical marker tablets, facsimile pages from Indian deeds, pictures of Penn and some of the Delaware chiefs, and Arnold Anderson's clever etching of Penn's first arrival in Pennsylvania on the *Welcome* in 1682. The book is well printed, and the editorial work is excellent. The copies are numbered and signed by the author.

Bryn Mawr College. WILLIAM ROY SMITH.

War and Trade in the West Indies, 1739-1763. By RICHARD PARES, Fellow of All Souls College. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1936. Pp. xi, 631. $8.50.)

MR. Pares does not aim to give a comprehensive and chronological narrative of the wars of Anglo-Spanish and Anglo-French rivalry. Such treatment is available in histories by Admiral Richmond and Sir Julian Corbett. His book is rather a highly valuable critical commentary upon diplomacy,

naval strategy, and neutral and illicit trade, as these were conditioned by economic need and the prevailing philosophy of commerce. It is based almost wholly upon an imposing body of manuscripts, examined with critical thoroughness and good judgment. These include materials from the foreign ministries of France and England; admiralty records, particularly of courts of admiralty and prize appeals; colonial, state, and treasury records; correspondence in the historical societies of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, and Pennsylvania, in the Essex Institute and the John Carter Brown Library; and the invaluable letter books of Wilkinson and Gaviller of London. Mr. Pares had to leave the Spanish archives unexplored.

Diplomatic dueling preceding the Spanish War concerned Spain's right of search, seizures, and the logwood trade at Campeachy. The *guarda-costas*, according to Mr. Pares, got out of hand and molested England's traffic with her own colonies. We still await the Spanish version. Spain, however, did agree to pay £95,000 damages, the nonpayment of which was the proximate cause of war. A policy of annexation in Spanish America sponsored by England was opposed by planters who feared a depression of sugar prices. But attempts at conquest were futile, though England's retention of the Mosquito Shore secured a foundation for British Honduras. The only creditable performance of the war was Anson's campaign in the Pacific. He, with Vernon in the Atlantic, paralyzed the galleon trade. Illicit commerce with Spanish Americans was nevertheless extensive and even protected by the navy. Much property in Spanish fleets was really French, and France would not acquiesce in seeing England run away with the trade of Spanish America. Negotiations are revealed at length: Fleury's enigmatic cleverness against Waldegrave's feeble stupidity and Newcastle's wrongheadedness. Diplomacy is correlated with naval strategy, much of which missed fire.

In 1744 Britain was at war with France. "The French war was what the Spanish war was not, a matter of life and death". The aim of each contestant was to destroy, not take, the plantations of the other. So far as England desired conquest, she wanted it in Canada. But even in the West Indies, by the end of the Seven Years' War, fear overcame avarice, and planters approved the conquest of several French islands for the sake of military security.

British and French naval strategies are compared. The French system was to send out its fleet anew each year. Ships were poorly provisioned, engaged in petty trade which impaired efficiency, and crippled for want of repairs. England had the station system, with dockyards capable of any repairs at Jamaica, Leeward Islands, and Halifax, and regular squadrons, well-provisioned, were based on these stations. British strategy afforded better defense but lacked ease of concentration for decisive impact on the enemy's fleet. The author inclines to defend the system against Admiral Richmond's criticism of British failure to achieve more decisive action, yet

he himself recognizes that, while British strategy seriously crippled French trade during the Seven Years' War, it did not put French colonies permanently out of action.

British economic pressure might have been more decisive if English and colonial merchants and officials had possessed sacrificial determination to isolate the French. But that spirit was deficient in the eighteenth century, as it still is for enforcement of sanctions in the twentieth. Mercantile regulations were relaxed on both sides, and illicit trade was rampant both directly and by neutral ports and "flags of truce". Mr. Pares has confirmed the picture presented by earlier historians and has amplified it, particularly by abundant citations from the high court of admiralty. The French lived precariously but survived.

The diplomacy of the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, of Keene's Treaty of 1750 with Spain involving subversion of the South Sea interest, of renewed contention with Spain over logwood, fishing rights, and violations of Spanish neutrality culminating in the Family Compact and Spain's entry into war—all is unfolded against a background of party politics, personal reputation, and safety. Had the capture of Manila been known in time, England might have kept Mindanao and, contrary to Corbett, Manila too. A good critique of the Peace of Paris leaves an impression of ministerial mediocrity baffled by crosscurrents of interest. "Pitt", concludes Mr. Pares, "was the only man in the first rank of politics who dealt in terms of economic or strategic value, and considered colonial acquisitions as something more than so many debating-points for or against the Ministry. That is why, in spite of its exaggerations and inconsistencies, Pitt's is the only opposition to the Peace of Paris that can be justified or pardoned, and why Pitt remains, for all his insincerity and demagogy, the one living figure among a generation of shadows."

Pomona College. FRANK W. PITMAN.

Military Affairs in North America, 1748-1765: Selected Documents from the Cumberland Papers in Windsor Castle. Edited by STANLEY PARGELLIS. [The American Historical Association.] (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 1936. Pp. xxxi, 514. $8.00.)

THIS volume embodies a selection of relevant documents drawn from the American portion of the Duke of Cumberland's papers, recently discovered in Windsor Castle. The Duke of Cumberland, second son of George II, was captain general of the British army from 1745 to 1757, in which official capacity he played an important part in the determination of military policies respecting America during the years mentioned. The selections from his papers made by Dr. Pargellis are altogether admirable, and the result is a volume of exceptional value to students of American colonial history.

The highly valuable Cumberland Papers appear to have been preserved

by accident. Apparently, care was never taken to retain a complete file of correspondence, many of Cumberland's own letters and those to him having been loaned from time to time to other persons and never returned. A large proportion of the papers in the collection did not, in fact, originate in Cumberland's office or in those of his correspondents but came to him through various official channels. Thus there are found copies of letters to and from persons other than Cumberland, memoranda, journals, inventories, memoirs, instructions, and maps. The American portion contains some four hundred pieces, and of these 136 are printed and 52 are calendared in the present volume. Dr. Pargellis assures us that the selections in question constitute the most valuable portion of the American papers. They mainly concern military plans and related topics and economic conditions in the colonies.

The central theme of the volume is the military offensive against the French in North America. In this connection the fundamental contributions of Cumberland and Lord Loudon in their insistence upon the creation of a comparatively small staff of experts and their plans of offense are clearly disclosed. The foundation for the future success of British arms was built by these men, who in the light of these records appear to have been less stupid than has generally been believed. But the documents relate to more than plans of campaign; they also provide new information concerning forts and their distribution, the union of the colonies, the service of supply, the number and condition of British and provincial troops and their rank and pay, Indian relations, and the co-operation of land and naval forces. One group of papers relates to the ill-fated Braddock expedition; their importance has already been elucidated by the editor in his article, "Braddock's Defeat" (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLI, 253-69). Other significant papers concern the rates of exchange in the colonies and the location and condition of roads. Six contemporary maps are reproduced: a sketch of Braddock's march from Fort Cumberland, two sketches of the battle of Monongahela by Patrick McKellar, a plan of Chignectou and one of Fort Beauséjour by J. Brewse, and a sketch of Oswego by McKellar.

In his introduction to the volume Dr. Pargellis contributes a penetrating essay on the significance of the papers. The book is implemented with a well-organized index. With respect to printing and binding, the publishers are to be congratulated on the excellent appearance of the volume.

Department of State. CLARENCE E. CARTER.

Stratford Hall, the Great House of the Lees. By ETHEL ARMES. With an Introduction by Franklin D. Roosevelt. (Richmond: Garrett and Massie. 1936. Pp. xxiv, 575. $10.00.)

STRATFORD Hall, on the Potomac, was built some time between 1725 and 1730. It is thus older than Mount Vernon, the only one of the Potomac houses that surpasses it in historic interest. It stands today a lonely survivor

of a type of society which, for good or ill, no longer accords with the American ideal. Its builder, Thomas Lee, was the head of the political and social organization that governed Virginia in the first three quarters of the eighteenth century. No European aristocracy ever generated a more engrossing company of "barons", and, as the baronial order of the Middle Ages rested upon serfdom, so this had its foundation in slavery. The paradox presented by this un-American phenomenon is that the system symbolized by Stratford Hall gave the nation many of its foremost leaders in the fight for independence. Founded as an exclusive demesne of wealth and political power, Stratford was the birthplace of Richard Henry Lee, proposer in the Continental Congress of the resolution of American independence, Francis Lightfoot Lee, signer, with his brother, of the Declaration, William Lee, sheriff of London and diplomatic commissioner of the new nation to Berlin and Vienna, and Arthur Lee, secret agent of the United States in London, afterward joint commissioner with Franklin and Deane in Paris and sole commissioner to Spain. All these chieftains of the Revolution first saw light in the celebrated east room of Stratford. The family, from its first settlement in 1640 to the collapse of the Confederacy in 1865, plays a great part in the evolution of the nation.

Stratford was sturdily built, with thick walls made of good Virginia bricks baked on the premises; it has therefore escaped the destruction that has doomed most of the Potomac homes and is as fundamentally intact today as it was two hundred years ago. The spirit of preservation and restoration which is accomplishing so much for these monuments of the past has found in this ancient pile a most worthy object. Miss Armes was the first mover in the rescue of the building from the neglect into which it had sunk. She is largely responsible for the organization of the Robert E. Lee Memorial Foundation and has spent all her time for ten years investigating Stratford and its past, collecting records, letters, and miscellaneous manuscripts. This research forms the basis of the present book. It therefore presents an excellent groundwork for those who wish to study the history of the famous site and to gain, informally, the main facts in the achievements of the Lees and their influence in molding American history. That the volume has aroused a lively controversy adds in a sense to its interest. Members of the Lee family have pointed out a good many misstatements. The author's temerity in laying bare certain scandalous episodes has aroused considerable wrath. That an eighteenth century daughter of the Lees should have lived "in sin" for many years with a Virginia scion of lesser breed is a revelation not pleasing to her descendants, though it throws a new and interesting light on the Virginia of the eighteenth century that this advanced lady's brothers, including the great Richard Henry and Francis Lightfoot, never treated her as an outcast or excluded her from their brotherly or family companionship. The malodorous record of the last Henry Lee, through whose licentious life

and dishonest behavior, the great estate was lost to the Lee family, is also set down in abundant detail. These are the days when complete frankness in history and biography is the prime requisite. Miss Armes is therefore not to be criticized for including these episodes in her family story, though she cannot escape censure for a carelessness that frequently leads to errors of fact.

BURTON J. HENDRICK.

Revolutionary New Hampshire: An Account of the Social and Political Forces underlying the Transition from Royal Province to American Commonwealth. By RICHARD FRANCIS UPTON. [Guernsey Center Moore Foundation.] (Hanover: Dartmouth College. 1936. Pp. x, 276. $3.00.)

AMONG studies of the Revolutionary period this book, which reflects great credit upon its youthful author and upon Professor Stevens of Dartmouth, who directed his work, is unique. McCrady's volumes on South Carolina are written from a different viewpoint and on an entirely different scale. Lincoln's *The Revolutionary Movement in Pennsylvania* does not go beyond the year 1776. Abbott's *New York in the American Revolution* deals only with the city of New York. Eckenrode's *The Revolution in Virginia* devotes more space to politics but less to economic and social problems. In a series of what are virtually sixteen separate essays, totaling a little over two hundred pages, Mr. Upton has narrated the political, constitutional, military, financial, economic, and social history of New Hampshire from 1763 to 1784. Nothing of importance seems to have been omitted, but at times one feels that the abundant material at the writer's disposal has been unduly compressed and that more of those significant details which often illuminate the course of events might well have been included.

The writer's viewpoint is wholly modern in its emphasis on social and economic factors. The Revolutionary contest in New Hampshire he interprets as one between a ruling oligarchy, which clung to the British connection because upon it depended the preservation of the social status quo, and those who for one reason or another wished to change that status quo. Applying to New Hampshire the various general formulas which have been suggested to account for the Revolution, he finds that "no one of them can be trusted in its entirety". With its large frontier population New Hampshire theoretically should have been among the more radical of the colonies, but actually one of its frontier counties had a considerable group of Loyalists, and the province as a whole was slower to move than any of the other New England colonies. This apparent conservatism is accounted for largely by the popularity and tact of John Wentworth, the last royal governor.

In his treatment of the political aspects of the Revolutionary movement the author is less successful. The names of the leaders who supplanted the Wentworth oligarchy appear repeatedly, but they are not made to stand out as distinct individuals. It is not made clear, at least to this reviewer, why

these particular men emerged as leaders of the Revolutionary cause, or how they organized and directed the Revolutionary forces. What, for example, was the secret of Meshech Ware's ability to remain chairman of the Committee of Safety and virtual chief executive of the state during the whole war period? Was John Langdon, as one might infer from certain passages in the narrative, governed largely by the profit motive?

The chapters which deal with the way New Hampshire met the various problems of the time are models of condensation. In attacking local problems New Hampshire's action was marked on the whole by wisdom and moderation. The willingness of the state to co-operate with the Continental Congress and with its neighbors reflects credit upon its leaders. Of particular interest is the chapter on "Industry and the Revolution", which calls attention to the efforts of the states to solve common economic problems by regional economic conferences.

This volume might well serve as a model for a series of studies which should cover in a similar manner the history of each of the thirteen original states in the Revolutionary period. Only when such a series is completed will it be possible to form a just estimate of the forces, local as well as general, which disrupted the first British Empire and brought to birth a new nation.

Williams College. A. H. Buffinton.

The Commerce of North Carolina, 1763-1789. By Charles Christopher Crittenden, Secretary of the North Carolina Historical Commission. [Yale Historical Publications.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1936. Pp. x, 196. $2.50.)

The introductory chapters of this volume provide an excellent background for studying the commerce of North Carolina. They show that both ocean-going commerce and inland transportation reached sizable proportions despite such difficulties as the treacherous waters of the coast and the extremely poor quality of the roads. Although the author does not attempt a definitive treatise on the effects of the navigation acts, he relates the British mercantilist system to North Carolina's commercial growth and concludes that this system was more advantageous to North Carolina than to any other continental colony. A chapter describing the naval stores, provisions, lumber, and tobacco, the chief products of the period, fills in this well-arranged background.

With expectations high, one comes upon the statement that, owing to lack of sources, "a description of the commerce of colonial North Carolina can never be complete or perfectly accurate". The reports sent by the naval officers to the Board of Trade are not to be found today, and although recently new materials have been discovered, great gaps still exist in the records. The author has computed tables too long and too complex to include in his book and has placed them in the archives of the North Carolina Historical

Commission. With the records as incomplete and unsatisfactory as the author says they are, and the tables based upon them so long and complex, one wonders to what extent the conclusions on the export and import trade are justified. If a digest of the tables prepared could have been given in an appendix, or even if fuller references to the records of the various ports had been given in the footnotes, the reader would have been greatly helped.

The sources for the trade of the back country are scarce, and, as the author points out, the completeness of the records of the Moravians leads to their taking a larger part in his discussion than their importance justifies. The account of the colonial merchants is far more satisfactory, thanks to the valuable information in the Audit Office papers. On account of the fullness of the published records the discussion of war and commercial disorder is twice the length of the next longest chapters. Trade after the war reached greater proportions than ever before, but conditions were similar to those of the late colonial period.

Mr. Crittenden's monograph is a valuable addition to the history of North Carolina and of the period covered. He has worked faithfully over the sources and has put in available form what previously had to be searched for very widely. One must bear in mind, however, that the length of treatment of different topics is determined not so much by their relative importance as by the availability of the sources. The critical bibliography will be of great help to the student of the period. The map of North Carolina in 1770 is valuable for showing the ports of that time and the complexity of the coast and waterways.

Columbia, Missouri. LOUISE I. STEPHENS.

The Territorial Papers of the United States. Volume IV, *The Territory South of the River Ohio, 1790-1796.* Edited by CLARENCE EDWIN CARTER. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1936. Pp. ix, 517. $1.75.)

ORIGINAL materials relating to the history of the Southwest Territory, as it was usually called, are widely scattered and difficult of access. In this volume Professor Carter has collected those of an official nature. He has used not only the documents preserved in the departmental and legislative archives in Washington but various other collections scattered in state repositories.

A large part of the documents deal with Indian affairs, and it is this phase of the history of the territory that is most completely covered by the publication. The idea that the white man was usually the aggressor in the desultory warfare of the forest is hardly borne out in these pages. The continuous and murderous assaults made by the Creeks upon the people of the Cumberland settlements were prompted by no conflicting land claims but merely by an insatiable desire on the part of the red man for scalps.

The refusal of Congress to provide for retaliatory expeditions and Governor Blount's success—except in one instance—in preventing unauthorized

raids indicate that frontier peoples were less self-assertive than has usually been supposed. These facts testify also to the ability of Blount as governor and to his desire to see Federal authority established. The discord engendered by the State of Franklin movement and by the schemes of the Yazoo land companies would not have been quieted so easily by a man of less address. But the official papers, as is usual in the case of such documents, do not disclose the underlying political and economic complications. On the surface, governmental activity seemed to progress much more smoothly than it actually did, and Blount appears in the role of irreproachable defender of constituted authority. His private papers furnish a startling contrast, as when, for instance, he wrote, on January 7, 1782, to his brother: "If it is possible . . . have it [a certain tract of land] condemned in Georgia either by Party, Bribery, or in any other way".

Although, naturally, little material dealing with the economic life of the area is included, the extension of the postal system to the territory is interestingly developed. At the close of 1794 the mail route was extended from Abingdon to Knoxville, and the next year Nashville was reached by a route from Bardtown, Kentucky. The Western mail, weighing about a hundred and twenty pounds, was dispatched from Philadelphia to Lancaster by stage. The Northwestern mail was forwarded to the Ohio and down that stream. That for the Southwest went by Fredericksburg, Richmond, Charlottesville, and Staunton, the riders making the trip fortnightly to Abingdon and Knoxville.

The editing has been done with that scholarly care which has come to be expected of Professor Carter. Much collateral material is cited, and all principal characters are identified. A map of the territory and adjacent Indian villages would have been a useful addition to the work.

The University of Virginia. THOMAS PERKINS ABERNETHY.

The Hill Country of Northern New England: Its Social and Economic History, 1790-1930. By HAROLD FISHER WILSON. [Columbia University Studies in the History of American Agriculture, edited by Harry J. Carman and Rexford Guy Tugwell.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1936. Pp. xiv, 455. $4.25.)

THE text of this pioneer work, which is designed to cover 140 years of the agricultural experience of the hill people of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, is complete with illustrations, maps and charts, numerous footnotes, statistical appendixes, and a lengthy bibliography. Presented in the form of detailed treatment and general conclusion, this study offers valuable information concerning one of the most interesting regions of the United States.

In the era of subsistence farming accompanied by rapid increase of

population, which ended about 1830, conditions from a material point of view were reasonably satisfactory. Thereafter until subsequent to 1900, though the coming of the railroad and the rise of the sheep industry added stimulus for a time, the economic trend, characterized by serious loss of population through emigration and disastrous competition with Western products, ran rather steadily against the agriculturist. In the last three decades, though competition continued, the improvement of communication and transportation facilities, introduction of rural electrification, wider adoption of the practices of scientific farming, development of specialized types of agriculture, and the increasing importance of northern New England as a recreational center, enabled rural residents by 1930 to face the future with considerable assurance.

A major criticism of the study is the narrowness of scope with which the author has envisaged his task. He has confined his interest largely to economic and statistical data and as a consequence, despite the promise of his subtitle, tells only half the story.

In an economic sense the text would be improved by giving attention to agricultural financing and tenancy and by adding discussion of the mechanical inventions of farmers. The annals of the Patent Office contain numerous records of the ingenuity of these Northern Yankees. Further, there is no consideration given to the land systems in vogue, especially in that formative period following the close of the Revolutionary War. The unique architecture in which the house, barns, and other buildings are all joined together is likewise deserving of consideration.

As for the social aspect, religious activities, educational development, everyday life of the household and community, the amusements of the rural districts, morals, cultural interests, and literature are inadequately treated or totally neglected. Also, there is insufficient explanation as to how the population present in 1790 had arrived, and what racial strains were represented.

Diaries, letters, account books, and other manuscript materials are conspicuous for their absence in the sources consulted. Newspapers and agricultural periodicals, two of the best kinds of contemporary information, were used much too sparingly. To cite one example, the files of the Albany, New York, *Cultivator,* which was not referred to at all, contain, in the ten year period, 1843-1852, upwards of three hundred articles on Northern New England written by some one hundred and thirty-one individuals of the region. Extensive use of the type of sources cited above would not only have made possible a broadening of the scope of the study but would also have supplied the atmosphere and "feel" of the period, which often is so noticeably lacking.

The reader who is looking for a detailed economic study will find much

that is worthwhile in Mr. Wilson's book. If he is seeking a treatise which also covers the social phases of life, he will not find it here. I hope Mr. Wilson will enlarge his study to give the full picture.

McCormick Historical Association, Chicago. HERBERT A. KELLAR.

The Commerce Power versus States Rights. By EDWARD S. CORWIN. (Princeton: University Press. 1936. Pp. xiv, 276. $2.50.)

The Commerce Clause under Marshall, Taney, and Waite. By FELIX FRANKFURTER. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1937. Pp. 114. $1.00.)

The Supreme Court and Political Questions. By CHARLES GORDON POST, JR. [The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1936. Pp. 145. $1.25.)

CONSTITUTIONAL history is more than the study of the interpretation of the Constitution by the Supreme Court. However, as the last three years have made clear, that process is one of the most dramatic, as it is certainly one of the most significant and one of the most teachable, parts of the story. Professor Corwin's tract, or rather brief, for the times illustrates admirably the bearing of century-old disputes upon the controversies of the day. Intended primarily as an answer to the majority opinions in the Rail Road Retirement Act, Guffey Coal Act, and A.A.A. cases, it was written before the Wagner Labor Act decision, in which Chief Justice Hughes and Justice Roberts made evident their acceptance of the slightly amended adage, "a switch in time saves nine". This recent change of majorities does not mean that the nationalist principle of interpretation has been accepted once and for all by the court. As Professor Corwin shows, the history of the court contains many examples of retreat from the acceptance of nationalist doctrines embodied in previous decisions. The desirability of a nationalist interpretation Professor Corwin takes for granted. What he is concerned to attack are the various restrictive doctrines which grew up after the death of Marshall. They developed not as limitations on congressional power but as dicta expressed in opinions sustaining state control. Since 1895, and especially in the first child labor case, doctrines have been devised out of these dicta which served to confine national powers not so much in the interest of state rights as in the defense of laissez faire. Perhaps Professor Corwin would not agree that the point of view of Marshall's contract opinions is here used to limit his nationalism, but it seems to me that that is what has occurred. Some readers of the book will question the extent to which the author carries his opposition to decentralization, but even they can but admire the learning and the dialectical skill with which he dissects the opinions of Justices Day and Roberts.

Professor Frankfurter is writing of the period before the Supreme Court began to restrict the commerce powers of Congress. His admiration for

Marshall is made clear. Indeed, as in Professor Corwin's book, I could wish that the author had more frankly faced the problem of Marshall's approval of nationalism in an age when the central government made few attempts to interfere with private property and his restrictive interpretation of state control of vested rights when only the states sought to regulate. But Professor Frankfurter has as his principal objective not the adding of one more tribute to the many bestowed upon the greatest chief justice. Rather does he wish to help in rescuing Taney from the unenviable classification usually accorded him and to rescue Waite from oblivion. He believes that both had the qualities of judicial statesmanship, that they lacked "that general animus against legislation which leads to frustrating interpretation" (p. 59). "Like Taney before him and Holmes in our own time, Waite illustrates that judicial self-limitation may be the most significant aspect of judicial action in the American constitutional scheme" (p. 95). As Taney is not to be judged by his Dred Scott opinion alone, so Waite is not adequately characterized as a man who "had neither the power nor the subtlety of Marshall or Taney. . . . Waite's temperament was staid, and his imagination was never ignited by the spark of genius. But he did not confine the Constitution within the limits of his own experience, nor did he read merely his own mind to discover the powers that may be exercised by a great nation" (pp. 110-11). In one of the finest of his essays Professor Thayer wrote: "Petty judicial interpretations have always been, are now, and always will be, a very serious danger to the country." Professor Frankfurter has shown in these brilliant lectures that Taney and Waite are in the select group of those justices whose conception of the Constitution was not petty.

Professor Post's monograph is a competent analysis of one of the most curious varieties of judicial self-limitation. Beginning with Luther *v.* Borden in 1849 the Supreme Court has developed a category of "political questions", that is, of questions into which it will not inquire but will instead take the decision of the executive or the Congress as the basis for its ruling. In that case, as in certain Reconstruction cases and one or two of more recent times, the clause of the Constitution involved was the guarantee of a "republican form of government" to the states. A number of cases involving the Indian tribes have also been included in it. Most of the decisions coming under this classification, however, concern the beginning and termination of wars and questions of foreign affairs. The category is not a well-defined one, and it is probable that it will in the future be confined to a relatively limited range of cases involving domestic issues. It is at least possible, however, that it will at some time be made a convenient rubric under which the court will include a larger and more important range of issues with which it appears inexpedient to deal by judicial means.

Harvard University. BENJAMIN F. WRIGHT, JR.

Pedlar's Progress: The Life of Bronson Alcott. By Odell Shepard. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 1937. Pp. xvi, 546. $3.75.)

Professor Shepard's life of Bronson Alcott is not only an admirable biography of a much neglected but important figure in American letters; it is also in itself an important contribution to American letters, notable for the excellence of the writing and still more for a point of view which illuminates its own era as well as that of which it treats.

The technical merits of the work, mentioned by every reviewer, need little re-emphasis here. If ever a biography was based upon definitive sources, *Pedlar's Progress* may claim that distinction. Professor Shepard is certainly the only man since Bronson Alcott to have read the five million words of the latter's Journal (even the patient F. B. Sanborn, who essayed the task in preparing his own life of Alcott, found it too much for him and gave it up), and it seems unlikely that any other man in the history of the world will repeat this laborious achievement. Further new sources include stenographic records of Alcott's public "Conversations", manuscript accounts of his tours in the West, and several hundreds of letters written to or by him. In addition, Professor Shepard seems to have read everything written about Alcott and is of course thoroughly familiar with the history and literature of the period. He has lived where his hero lived, observed the scenes that met his eye, read the books that he read, and endeavored sympathetically to rethink his thoughts. Interest in Alcott having reawakened several years ago, some such biography was sure to be written by someone, but there was no reason to anticipate anything half so good.

There is little that is controversial in the events of Bronson Alcott's life, and Professor Shepard's new sources have served mainly to amplify rather than alter the familiar picture. The chief new points which he has brought to light are the direct influence of Pestalozzi (usually denied) on Alcott's educational theories, as well as the influence of his cousin, William Andrus Alcott; the defection of Elizabeth Peabody from the cause of the Temple School in its time of greatest need; and the hostility between Alcott's colleague Lane and Mrs. Alcott as leading up to the failure of Fruitlands.

The most interesting aspect of *Pedlar's Progress* remains its point of view. The book, as any good biography will, recreates the era in which its central character lived and gives exceptionally vivid portraits of the men and women with whom he came in contact—the Peabody sisters, the Channings, Theodore Parker, William Lloyd Garrison, Margaret Fuller, the Concord group, and later the St. Louis group, and in doing so always keeps close to fact, but fact interpreted sympathetically, idealistically, rather than critically. A faint nostalgia for New England's "golden day" gives the work much the same sort of autumnal charm that is found in *The Flowering of New England* by Van Wyck Brooks. There is no falsification, but there is considerable selection dominated by a will to see the period in its most attractive guise.

In this attitude the author expresses the latest mood of American literature itself. The era of muckraking and denigration seems definitely over, and for good or ill we are apparently headed for a period of mild hero worship. In the recent flood of historical and regional novels it is as if the authors had taken to heart Van Wyck Brooks's advice of long ago to find the "usable past" in our history. In so far as this implies merely a correction of the overly censorious attitude of the twenties and a rediscovery of real values it is, of course, all to the good, but, unfortunately, the rediscovered values may be spurious, and too much acidity may be followed by too much sweetness. In Professor Shepard's work both the merits and the dangers of the new approach are clearly revealed.

The periods of human life most likely to be sentimentalized are childhood and old age, and *Pedlar's Progress* exemplifies this tendency. Its opening and closing chapters are the weakest; informative and charmingly written like the others, they lack the intellectual bone and sinew found in the body of the work. There Professor Shepard rightly stresses and restresses Alcott's importance as an educator. He is well within the truth in stating that Alcott's first two years of teaching, in a Connecticut country school, showed "a greater advance in teaching-method than all the schoolmasters in America had made in as many centuries". Alcott, rather than Horace Mann, was the real pioneer in the field of American education. In his work in Connecticut, in Philadelphia, and in Boston Alcott attempted to introduce nearly all of the reforms that the most progressive American teachers are today still struggling to realize: the beautifying of the schoolroom, the integration of the arts with the rest of the curriculum, the arousing of student interest, the rational use of play, acceptance of the principle of student self-government, preference of the inductive over the deductive method, equal emphasis upon individual development and social co-operation, use of the now sadly formalized "quiz" as a means of stimulating creative mental activity, and the attempt (still usually regarded as "dangerous to the social order") to arouse independent thinking in matters of morals and to appeal to the student's conscience as well as his bare intellect.

But the same importance by no means adheres to Alcott's metaphysics of mingled Neo-Platonism and subjective idealism, the chief significance of which lies in the fact that Emerson was somewhat infected by it, to the weakening of his own quite different approach. Alcott's metaphysics became his main interest only after the total failure of his experiment in social reform at Fruitlands; thereafter he was a wounded warrior, wounded to death, who found escape from despair in mental flight from the world (made easier by the financial assistance of his friends and the economic success of Louisa's *Little Women*). His sad decline into ever flabbier ways of thought is glossed over by Professor Shepard in chapters with but too-revealing titles —"The Everlasting Arms", "The Fountain of Youth", and "Harvest

Home". These lapses of the overly benevolent biographer should be forgiven, like those of his hero, in view of the magnificence of the earlier accomplishment.

New York City. ERNEST SUTHERLAND BATES.

Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States: Inter-American Affairs, 1831-1860. Selected and arranged by WILLIAM R. MANNING, Division of Latin American Affairs, Department of State. Volume VI, *Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France;* Volume VII, *Great Britain;* Volume VIII, *Mexico, 1831-1848 (Mid-Year).* (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 1935; 1936; 1937. Pp. xxxii, 735; xxxi, 785; xliii, 1106. $5.00 each.)

IN these three large volumes Dr. Manning continues his valuable compilation of documents, which is now approaching completion. Like their predecessors these volumes are edited with utmost care, and each is provided both with a complete list of documents and with an exhaustive index.

In Volume VI the important documents relating to the Dominican Republic have to do with the efforts of the United States, France, and Great Britain to shield that republic from the aggressions of Haiti. Samaná Bay arouses interest as a possible naval base, and French and Spanish influence over the Dominican government stands revealed. The correspondence dealing with Ecuador displays uneasiness on the part of the United States and some of the South American republics with respect to possible European aggressions. It also shows that the United States is intensely interested in opening the Amazon and all of its tributaries to the free navigation of the vessels of all nations. The section devoted to France reveals the various activities of that nation in Hispanic America: its interest in Mexico, the Río de la Plata area, the Dominican Republic, Cuba, Central America, and Ecuador, and its vigor in supporting the claims of its citizens.

The documents in Volume VII, which deals with Great Britain, are rich in information regarding British interests and activities in Texas, Cuba, Central America, Mexico, and southern South America. They exhibit in most vivid manner the rivalry of the two Anglo-Saxon nations with respect to Hispanic America.

The correspondence contained in Volume VIII bears on the stormy relations of the United States and Mexico down to the middle of the year 1848, the documents for the next ten years being reserved for another volume, as likewise the communications from Texas. The main issues of this period, as is well known, are boundaries, claims, and Texas, culminating in the Mexican War and the treaty of 1848.

Concerning all three of these volumes it may be observed that comparatively few facts are revealed which are not already familiar to specialists in American diplomacy. Nevertheless the volumes will be of highest value

to those less familiar with the various subjects discussed by the diplomats and especially to advanced undergraduates and postgraduates in colleges and universities. Previous volumes have contained more new materials, and this will also be true of the three or four volumes which are to follow. The correspondence in the large tomes now under review has, for the most part, been examined in manuscript by Smith, Reeves, Manning, Callahan, and others, whose works may now be scrutinized with renewed interest and profit.

The University of Chicago. J. Fred Rippy.

Charles Coulson Rich, Pioneer Builder of the West. By John Henry Evans. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1936. Pp. xv, 400. $3.50.)

Mr. Evans's biography of Charles Coulson Rich is an important contribution to Mormon history and indirectly to United States history, as it contains an intimate picture of an unpopular people's activities on the American frontier. It is based wholly upon unpublished materials, principally journals kept by the Rich family. It is written in an entertaining, narrative style, but it necessarily contains a great amount of expository material, which enhances its historical value. Mr. Evans's literary training is evident throughout.

The biography gives to the reader a kaleidoscopic picture of the Mormon movement from the rise of the church in 1830 to the death of Rich in 1883. The story is centered in the activities of one man, yet his life was so closely interwoven with the major movements of his people that his biography is a revelation of the early spread of Mormonism, the conflict of the Saints with their neighbors in Missouri and Illinois, the martyrdom of the Prophet Joseph Smith, the moving of the Saints westward under the leadership of Brigham Young, and, finally, the settlement of the Great West.

Immediately after initiation into Mormonism (April 1, 1832) Rich visited the Prophet at Kirtland, Ohio. Convinced, stimulated, and filled with what Mormons call a testimony, he was ready to give all that he possessed for his newly adopted religion. Six times he built homes for his family—each time in a different state—because his religion demanded that he do so. He was captain of the pioneer company which brought the Mormon artillery into the Great Basin in the trek westward from Nauvoo. Fervently he proselyted both in Europe and America. Evans's biography shows that Rich could build houses, shoe oxen, preach sermons, command an army, police a city, establish and govern new settlements, and help to make laws for a new commonwealth. This indomitable frontiersman's life was pregnant with perseverance, faith in God, loyalty, and high regard for duty.

In the days of violence and persecution in Missouri he took a prominent part as a captain in the Mormon militia in protecting his people. Later he was second in command in the Nauvoo Legion (1844), one of the three governing officials in Salt Lake City (1847-48), and an apostle in 1849.

Before his death he stood second in line for the presidency of the Mormon Church.

With his appointment to establish San Bernardino in Southern California (1851), Rich began his career as a colonizer. He devoted thirty years to land settlement. In 1863 he was assigned by Young to explore and settle Bear Lake Valley, which lies in northern Utah and southern Idaho. High altitude and cold climate made conditions forbidding, yet Rich willingly left his beautiful homes in Salt Lake City again for the religion he had sworn allegiance to. He pioneered this frontier and in nineteen years successfully supervised the establishing of twenty-two towns.

Mr. Evans points out that Rich's domestic life was also very successful. Nowhere did he find evidence of Rich's having a family quarrel with his six wives and fifty children. In three chapters devoted to the doctrine and practice of "plurality of wives", Evans describes the actual workings of Morman polygamy as it functioned in the Rich family. Those pages should interest students of sociology and history.

In general the book is historically accurate, yet there are several places where small errors appear. Evans used the Latter Day Saint Church archive materials insofar as they were directly concerned with Rich. But a more thorough examination of them shows that whereas Evans gives the population of Utah as one hundred thousand in 1847 (p. 226), the records indicate that it was only about forty thousand; that the lash actually was applied to lawbreakers during the first year in Salt Lake (p. 155); and that Brigham Young expanded his empire from the tops of the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean in his "State of Deseret" (p. 171).

The book is defective in an almost total lack of maps and charts. The text could have been more abundantly illustrated, thereby making it easier to follow Rich's activities in the numerous places mentioned. As the biography stands, one not well-informed in geography may find himself bewildered in a geographical maze. Footnotes to the text could have been used to good advantage.

Latter Day Saint Institute,
Utah State Agricultural College.
MILTON R. HUNTER.

Presidential Politics in the United States, 1841-1844. By OSCAR DOANE LAMBERT. [Duke University Publications.] (Durham: Duke University Press. 1936. Pp. ix, 220. $3.00.)

IN this book Mr. Lambert takes for his key to an understanding of Tyler's unhappy administration the conflicting personal ambitions and maneuverings of the leading political figures for the presidency in 1844. It is on this ground that he explains the break between Clay and Tyler over the bank bill in the summer of 1841, a break that disrupted the Cabinet and alienated from the President the adherents of Clay's program in the Whig party. Cut off from

their support on the one hand and opposed by the Democrats on the other, "His Accidency the President" (as Greeley contemptuously dubbed him) and the "Administration party" stood alone. The years of Tyler's presidency present, consequently, a record of factional wrangling and of insignificant achievement in the field of domestic legislation, while his efforts to build up a third party ended in failure and the withdrawal of his candidacy before the election of 1844.

It is with Mr. Lambert's interpretation of the causes of this situation that the reviewer takes issue. The often reiterated thesis of this study is that the mainspring of Tyler's actions, his vetoes and appointments, can be traced to a vaulting ambition. "The President had started his administration with one fixed idea, to succeed himself. In order to do this, he must lead, not follow Senator Clay who at that time was the undaunted leader of the Whigs" (p. 37). In order to achieve this ambition, Mr. Lambert believes, Tyler opposed Clay's program so that he might destroy Clay's standing and thus emerge from the conflict himself the leader of the Whig party.

But in this interpretation there appear to be two weaknesses. In the first place, there is no suggestion that Tyler might have acted upon principle in his opposition to Clay's cherished plan for a national bank. All Tyler's previous record—his opposition to Jackson, the fact that he was the only senator to cast a vote against the Force Bill, that he resigned his office rather than comply with the Virginia instructions in regard to the Expunging Resolution, that he ran on the state-rights Democratic White-Tyler ticket in 1836—is brushed lightly aside and, indeed, is not mentioned. Tyler is pictured as a Whig, elected to the vice-presidency in 1840, in full knowledge of and sympathy with Clay's program; but in office, owing to personal ambition and the influence of "the subtle and the crafty", he was prevailed upon to turn his back on the Whig party. In view of the lack of evidence to support such a view, this seems unfair. Tyler may have been ill-advised or maladroit, but his record speaks for his integrity.

In the second place, the fundamental flaw in Mr. Lambert's interpretation lies in the fact that he confuses Clay and his followers with the Whig party. But the Whig party in 1840 consisted of more elements than one. Never, indeed, did a political party represent a stranger composite—one time National Republicans and anti-Jackson Democrats, state-righters and unionists, pro- and anti-bank men, high and low tariff defenders—all united for the sole purpose of defeating Jackson's Van Buren. The failure of the Whig convention in December, 1839, to draft a platform, the selection of the innocuous Harrison for the ticket in the face of the greater claims of Clay—or even Webster—indicate a desire to tread delicately and avoid giving offense to any possible adherents. The choice of Tyler for the office of vice-president was indubitably motivated by the hope of drawing the state-rights Democrats to the party standard. For the major group of Whigs under Clay's leadership

it was a misfortune that Tyler was elevated to an unanticipated position of power; but at no time had Tyler represented himself under false colors. A state-rights Democrat, an anti-Jackson man, he had been and remained; it was by virtue of this very consistency that he won the vice-presidential nomination in 1840. The struggle, then, dramatized by the figures of Tyler and Clay was, in truth, a contest for dominance between two separate groups and principles strangely united under the label, "Whig-Party".

Similarly, Mr. Lambert seems to fall short of an appreciation of the factions in the Democratic party caused by anti-Van Burenism, although his exposition of the defeat of Van Buren for the nomination in 1844 is painstaking and of value, and his analysis of the role played by Jackson therein is particularly interesting. He has made wide use of manuscript sources, unpublished letters, and contemporary newspapers. Surprisingly, he does not include in his bibliography Lyon G. Tyler's *Letters and Times of the Tylers*.

To the reviewer the thesis that Tyler was designing and unprincipled seems unsubstantial. The true explanation of the disruption of the Whig party during his presidency, it may be hazarded, must still be traced to the diversity of interests it embraced.

Hunter College. DOROTHY BURNE GOEBEL.

Scientific Interests in the Old South. By THOMAS CARY JOHNSON. [The University of Virginia Institute for Research in the Social Sciences.] (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 1936. Pp. vii, 217. $2.50.)

THIS book essays to prove the creative vitality of the ante-bellum South. The author rejects the conventional interpretation of Southern culture in the era preceding the Civil War (pp. 3, n. 2, 4, 5, 197, 199) and asserts that intellectual life was distinguished by scientific study. The volume indicates a growing interest in the problems of intellectual history, but it succeeds only in establishing that scientific interests—nowhere defined—are reflected in the sources.

Professor Johnson enunciates no standards by which the evidence is to be judged, and he intentionally (p. v) neglects a comparison of the scientific interests of the South with those of other sections of the country—the only method which would have given meaning to his ardent research. It is a purely quantitative analysis, but even as such it fails to be convincing. No distinction is made between theoretical and applied science (pp. 6, 7, 173) or between the so-called natural and physical sciences. Why certain divisions of science (chemistry, geology, botany, p. v) are chosen to the exclusion of others (mathematics is only incidentally treated) the reader is left to guess. Reliance on college catalogues (esp. pp. 13, 26, 27, 29, 106, 107), however valuable when they are critically appraised, is an extremely hazardous procedure. The material in chapter II, "In College Halls", and chapter IV, "Sweet Southern Girls", would be intelligible if the institutions discussed were

classified and significant if compared with Northern schools of equal grade (esp. pp. 14, 111). Many will question the classification of St. Louis as a Southern city (pp. 172, 174), but more will doubt the propriety of so insistent a correlation between geography and scholarly production. Northerners who went South and Southerners who went North are indiscriminately claimed for the South. Joseph LeConte, for example, did his most effective teaching in California, and F. A. P. Barnard and J. W. Draper belong as much to New York as to Dixie.

Professor Johnson takes no cognizance of the larger implications of his subject. He disregards the historical dictum that a hostile environment enveloped the Southern mind, nor does he concern himself with its corollaries. If science truly flourished, where was the scientific temper? If the study of scientific method produced a scientific attitude of mind, why was its influence negligible?

University of South Dakota. BERT JAMES LOEWENBERG.

General Grant's Last Stand: A Biography. By HORACE GREEN. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1936. Pp. xvii, 334. $3.75.)

THIS book is built around a thin bundle of pencil notes, written by Grant the invalid, when the cancer in his throat limited his speech, and preserved as a personal treasure by his physician, Dr. John Hancock Douglas. Through family channels the notes came into the possession of Horace Green, war correspondent, editor, and writer. They relate to whatever happened to be passing through Grant's mind and deal with biographical content scattered through his whole career. Most of those that are here printed have a bearing on the *Personal Memoirs,* with which he was struggling in his race with death. Some, not printed, appear to contain privileged confidences for the private eye of his physician. Taken all in all, without adding much to our knowledge they help to define our picture of the mind of Grant.

The biographer, faced with the problem of presenting a little fragmentary material relating to a long story, has chosen to use the memoranda as though Grant, as he died, was reviewing his whole life. He has encroached a bit upon the domain of the historical novelist. He has measured the days of composition of the *Personal Memoirs,* helped sometimes by notes that Dr. Douglas set down for his own use. And he has drawn freely upon the *Memoirs* for material similar in character to that of the pencil notes. Left to himself, Grant wrote nakedly and factually of occurrences. It was his publishers' business to prod him into adding human touches. Mr. Green has been more nearly successful in his reconstruction of the "last stand" at Long Branch and Mount McGregor than one would have dared to hope.

The weaknesses of the book are due to the necessity of filling in gaps where neither the notes nor the *Memoirs* have provided materials for a new survey of the life of Grant. In this respect the execution of the scheme is less

successful than its conception. The author has drawn heavily from the writings of Woodward, McCormick, Coolidge, King, Badeau, and Porter; he has sometimes drawn from the wrong commentator and has occasionally drawn carelessly or been unaware of accessible material. He ascribes Governor Yates to Missouri and dates the visit of the Confederate peace commissioners in January, 1864. He places Humboldt Bay, where Grant acquired his bad habits if, indeed, he did acquire them, as "fourteen miles from Portland on the Oregon coast", whereas it is something like 350 miles from Portland and in the State of California. Mr. Green is properly sensitive to the unwarranted range of gossip about Grant's indulgence in alcohol. He examines the testimony and rates it as proving little. But he alludes so often to the words ascribed to Lincoln, "I wish I could . . . send it to my other generals", that it is too bad that he does not spike the sentence by telling how it was invented by a feature writer of the *New York Herald* and printed in a jocose column, November 28, 1863, or how it was an old locution even then, for Pitt is said to have remarked to George III, "If he [Wolfe] is mad, I wish he would bite some of your Majesty's other Generals." The book is worth adding to the growing literature on Grant.

University of California. FREDERIC L. PAXSON.

Laur. Larsen, Pioneer College President. By KAREN LARSEN. (Northfield: Norwegian-American Historical Association. 1936. Pp. viii, 358. $3.00.)

THIS work is based chiefly on the Laur. Larsen Papers in possession of the Larsen family, the H. A. Preus Papers, the Church Council Papers, and the collection of religious periodicals in Koren Library at Luther College, Decorah, Iowa. Many immigrant leaders kept careful records of their activities and often preserved their correspondence, forming a storehouse of information which has up to the present time remained, to a large degree, untapped by American historians.

It may seem that Laur. Larsen moved in a rather circumscribed circle and that his activities as a missionary in the North Central states among the Norwegian immigrants or as a professor at Concordia College in St. Louis or as the founder of Luther College would, therefore, have a very limited interest. But the importance of this biography does not rest on any fame that Larsen may have as the founder of a small Midwestern college or as a leader among the Norwegian Lutherans; in fact he was probably not the ablest leader produced by the Norwegians in America. Its importance is to be found in the fact that the problems faced by Larsen were faced by any number of immigrant leaders in similar positions.

The book throws light upon the efforts made by the Norwegian Synod toward self-preservation. It shows how the clergymen, educated abroad and in a tolerant atmosphere of a state church, were forced upon coming to

America to accept a more puritanical code of conduct, and how the immigrant groups were forced to fight proselyting and heresy and establish their own educational institutions when the state church refused to listen to pleas for aid from across the Atlantic. Soon a gap was created between the state church and the immigrant church, which was only widened by the sending of special messengers to Europe for aid, as the state church had little sympathy for the puritanical and doctrinaire atmosphere fostered in America. Thrown on their own, the immigrants were forced to educate their own ministers by founding educational institutions for that purpose. So Luther College was founded, and the customary problems of an immigrant college fill the pages of its history. The Norwegian Synod's attitude toward slavery and the continued efforts on the part of Larsen and his colleagues to defend slavery greatly embarrassed the success of the college, as the laity was predominantly Republican. Even after the Civil War had settled the slavery question, Larsen's stubborn attitude that slavery was Biblical undoubtedly did not increase the prestige of the newly founded college among his countrymen. Hardly had this question died before a doctrinal controversy rocked the entire Norwegian Synod and finally led to a schism, for in 1887 one third of the ministers withdrew from the synod. This controversy reacted unfavorably on the college, and when, in 1889, the college building burned to the ground, many were positive that the chapter of Luther College was a closed one. But this storm was weathered, and a new building was erected in 1890.

Larsen was intimately associated with this college as its first president from 1861 to 1902 and as professor of Hebrew from 1902 to 1911. He died on March 1, 1915, at the age of eighty-two. Miss Karen Larsen, in writing this biography of her father—the reader is conscious throughout of her relationship to him—has made an earnest and successful effort to be critical and modest in her conclusions. Particularly should she be praised for her efforts to describe the home life of the cultured Norwegian clergymen in America.

Augustana College. O. Fritiof Ander.

History of the State of New York. Edited by Alexander C. Flick. Volume VII, *Modern Party Battles;* Volume VIII, *Wealth and Commonwealth;* Volume IX, *Mind and Spirit.* [The New York State Historical Association.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1935; 1935; 1937. Pp. xiv, 385; xiv, 381; xv, 390. $50.00 for ten volumes.)

It was suggested in reviews of earlier volumes of this history that the more difficult part of the undertaking was still to come and that changes in the economic life of the state of New York, with the consequent upheaval of thought, would provide more baffling topics than those treated in volumes

covering the earlier period. Volumes VII and VIII carry the story into more complicated problems of politics and social organization and reveal no decline in comprehensiveness of treatment or skill in presentation.

As in previous reviews of this co-operative work, no attempt will be made to single out some contributions for praise and others for criticism. Such procedure would be the more invidious in that it would merely reflect the personal interests and preferences of the reviewer. The two volumes are to be viewed as a whole, and by this standard they must be adjudged successful, even excellent.

For the convenience of those who would know the range of the volumes it is sufficient to mention the contributions of the late Edwin Platt Tanner dealing with postwar problems and political reformers of the seventies and eighties and with state politics from Cleveland to Sulzer. Descriptive also of the period embraced by Volumes VII and VIII are the studies of constitutional developments, 1867-1915, and recent political developments, 1915-35, by Finla G. Crawford. These studies by a specialist in the administration of the state of New York are likely to be read by many whose thoughts are directed to the approaching state convention.

On the more distinctly economic side are the contribution of H. Parker Willis on wealth and banking in New York State and the competent treatment of public utilities, in earlier and later periods, by William E. Mosher. It is appropriate that any history of New York should give considerable space to humane institutions, the care of the needy, and the woman's movement, subjects presented by David M. Schneider, Harry Elmer Barnes, and Amy M. Gilbert. A chapter by Margaret Louise Plunkett on upstate cities and villages reveals skillful management of a complicated story.

Volume IX, *Mind and Spirit,* might be regarded as somewhat boldly conceived in view of the state's primacy in industry, but this volume does more than any preceding volume to justify this distinguished co-operative effort to isolate and treat the history of the state. Frank Pierrepont Graves's contribution on the history of the state education department is as convenient as it is interesting. Chapters by Robert Hastings Nichols, Frederick J. Zwierlein, and Albert M. Friedenberg deal respectively with Protestant churches and institutions, the Catholic church, and the Jews. The significance of these studies, both locally and nationally, is obvious. It was to be expected that a history of the state would emphasize literature, the newspaper, the theater, and art, intellectual activities which have so notably centered in the nation's metropolis. These topics have been discriminatingly treated by Stanley Thomas Williams, Allan Nevins, Oral Sumner Coad, and William Sawitzky.

Only one volume remains to be published. Its appearance will terminate a distinguished effort to present the story of a distinguished commonwealth.

Cornell University. JULIAN P. BRETZ.

The Woodrow Wilsons. By ELEANOR WILSON MCADOO. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1937. Pp. x, 301. $3.50.)

THIS volume gives information about personal attitudes and the Wilson family life such as we have about no other President, not even Washington or Jefferson. It deals, however, with the family only to the death of Mrs. Wilson in August, 1914. What the relations were during the terrible years 1914-1924 have not so much as been mentioned.

The author, Mrs. Eleanor Wilson McAdoo, was old enough when her father became president of Princeton University in 1902 to guess fairly the meaning of conduct and events. She was devoted to her parents and perhaps was unable to observe any mistakes in their conduct. It is clear, however, from her writings, as from other sources, that Woodrow Wilson and Ellen Axson, of middle-class Southern families, were remarkably idealistic and unselfish. Few couples have shown such devotion to the public interest as well as to each other. Their simple but ideal life at Princeton, both before and after 1902, is clearly shown in these pages.

Mrs. McAdoo does not describe in detail her father's plan to make Princeton a real university with a minimum of indifferent students and as little wasteful sport and athletics as possible. But she does indicate that he was trying to do there what his friend, President Eliot of Harvard, tried almost in vain to do for forty years. She describes fairly the opposition of students, parents, and even professors during the years 1905 to 1910. The co-operative devotion of the three daughters to their parents during the dramatic struggle of those years is shown a score of times in these pages.

When the governorship of New Jersey made Wilson a national character, a candidate even for the presidency, Eleanor, like all the other members of the family, was both happy and troubled. There was practically no wealth in the family, and it was not the habit of parties then to raise millions of dollars to help candidates. There were social limitations and political difficulties, which Colonel Edward M. House tried to amend and which George Harvey, a former friend, tried to increase. We get only glimpses of these things from the author. Perhaps such things were never completely revealed. When the famous Baltimore Convention was in session and the party bosses kept nearly all Virginia delegates hostile to their Staunton-born son, there were annoyances and actual depressions in the family. They were at Sea Girt, the vacation home of New Jersey governors. But the outcome of the two-weeks' convention was joyous, and the unique campaign of Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson followed. The family story then became national, and the final move to the White House brought its joys and anxieties.

The selection of the Cabinet brought Eleanor into relations with the widower, William G. McAdoo, which led the daughter of the President to marry the Secretary of the Treasury; but the new life in Washington did not prevent Jessie, another daughter, from marrying her fiancé, Francis B. Sayre,

a young professor at Williams College. These events and the problems of Mrs. Wilson are described in detail. Social matters, even descriptions of receptions and the many kinds of dresses that were worn, receive too much attention. Mrs. Wilson unexpectedly became ill during the summer of 1914; and the calamity of her death is described insofar as such a thing can be described. Then the book comes to an end. Perhaps another volume, describing the life which followed, may be in preparation. As one reads these repeated accounts of social affairs one wonders if the author realizes the tragedy of Woodrow Wilson's career.

Berlin. W. E. Dodd.

American Democracy and the World War. By Frederic L. Paxson. Volume I, *Pre-War Years, 1913-1917.* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1936. Pp. 427. $3.75.)

Since completing his duties as chief of the Historical Branch of the War Plans Division of the General Staff some twenty years ago, Professor Paxson has been busy assembling the material for a general history of the impact of the World War upon American democracy. Though modestly acknowledging in his preface that "it is too early for any historian to know it all", the author still maintains that it is not "too soon for an attempt to bring into reasonable proportion" a narrative of the period of the great upheaval; and this he aims to do by giving due emphasis to the social and cultural, as well as to the political, diplomatic, and military phases of the period. He believes that important new forces were at work on the American scene before the coming of the war and that they have been obscured and distorted "because war issues drew men's minds into an unnatural unity upon a single theme, diverting them from normal recognition of unfolding events" (p. 240). He thinks that when these trends in American life are more clearly appreciated the significance of the war itself may need to be restated "on a smaller scale". Therefore, instead of approaching his task, as some historians have done, under the hypnotic influence of the war psychosis, Professor Paxson treats the events leading up to our entrance into the war as only one (though a very important) phase of our national development in the first Wilson administration. It is this approach to the subject, rather than any significant new material or fresh interpretation of the old material, that gives the volume its interest for readers already surfeited with histories of the World War.

Professor Paxson adheres closely to the chronological method, which not only lends an annalistic tinge to his work but, since he is concerned to include a great number of social and cultural elements, also gives one the impression of discreteness or even disjointedness, something akin to the McMaster type of composition. A perusal of the topical analysis carried in

the headings of the right-hand pages will confirm this impression. To take a sample sequence, from pages 185 to 197, we read: "New York Constitutional Convention" (of 1915), "The Campaign [of 1912] in California", "The *New Republic*", "American Weekly Newspapers", "Woman Suffrage", "Labor Demands", "Prohibition". That the treatment of this variety of subjects is accurate in fact—only a few slips have been noted—and judicious in statement is a feature which compensates for the rather inordinate strain on mental adjustment.

In many places Professor Paxson's volume suggests the analogy between what he calls "The Democratic Receivership" of President Wilson and the crisis in which another Democratic President came into office just twenty years later. It might well have been Franklin Roosevelt in 1933 and not Woodrow Wilson in 1913 who said: "The people of the United States have turned their faces in a definite direction, and any party, any man who does not go with them in that direction they will reject and they ought to reject." Wilson's success in leading the way to a "better order" in the first years of his administration was such as to win the praise and admiration of men, from the common laborer up to Charles W. Eliot. His optimistic outlook was unclouded. On signing the Underwood tariff bill he said: "We are now about to take the second step, which will be the final step in setting the business of this country free". It was like Roosevelt's vision in *On Our Way*. Yet seven years after Wilson began to "make all things new" the nation, revolting against a surfeit of idealism, returned to the philosophy and practice of Thomas Platt and Mark Hanna. What will 1940 bring forth? Professor Paxson wisely makes no prophecies, but his treatment of the Wilson regime invites speculation.

One would wish that Professor Paxson had been as careful of his style as of his facts. There are sentences in the book which cannot but "make the judicious grieve" and others which convey a wrong meaning. For example, the phrase "when Buchanan presided over the attempts to disrupt the Union" (p. 19) would suggest that the President was a member of a secessionist convention; and the visualization of the sentence (p. 68), "Harrison, in his first session, had plunged upon this hardiest of American political perennials" (to wit, the tariff), leaves the reader with a picture of the dignified President impaled on a spike of delphinium. "The attempts to interpret the result of the appeal [for a Democratic Congress] to the people limped on both legs" (p. 188) is a no more convincing simile. To cite only one more of these too frequent ineptitudes, we find on page 232: "In a way, history was rolled back upon itself as a type of experience that wilted before steam revived with gasoline." It is too bad that an excellent book is marred by such rhetorical gashes.

Columbia University. D. S. Muzzey.

The Letters and Journal of Brand Whitlock. Chosen and edited with a Biographical Introduction by ALLAN NEVINS. Introduction by Newton D. Baker. Two volumes. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 1936. Pp. lxviii, 597; xv, 731. $10.00.)

THE career of Brand Whitlock ranks among the most colorful in recent American history. The son of a Middle Western Methodist clergyman, he educated himself without benefit of academic training by service as newspaper reporter, by studying the law in an office, and by omnivorous reading. His tastes and talents led him towards a career of creative writing, but he was diverted into municipal politics by his humanitarian instincts and by his personal enthusiasm for the work of "Golden Rule" Jones in Toledo. At the age of 36 he was himself elected mayor of Toledo and was afterwards re-elected to serve four terms, from 1905 to 1913. Despite his success he found politics distasteful. Perhaps with the example of his idol, W. D. Howells, in mind, he eagerly accepted Woodrow Wilson's offer of a diplomatic appointment as minister to Belgium. The idea was that thus he would gain leisure to write novels. Instead he found himself almost immediately in the heart of a European war. For two and a half years he remained in Brussels face to face with the German administration. After American intervention he rejoined the exiled Belgian court, returned to Brussels after the armistice, was named ambassador by Wilson; in 1921 he received the not surprising news that he had been superseded by a nominee of the Harding administration. Thereafter he lived in Europe, fulfilling his dream of a peaceful literary life. He died in 1934.

Whitlock was a prolific writer, and aside from the distinction he won during the war he was widely known from his semi-autobiographical works, *Forty Years of It* and *Belgium,* from his novels, and from his biographies. This edition of his letters and journal, however, throws a great deal of new light on his personality and provides a complete picture of his career. The papers have been arranged with skill by Professor Nevins in two volumes, the first including the letters, which run from the early nineties until Whitlock's death; the second, the detailed journal of the war years from the time of the German invasion of Belgium up to his retirement from the embassy. Of the letters, approximately a third deal with his early years and Toledo politics, a third with the war, and the final third, written chiefly from Cannes, with the quiet period of his retirement. Whitlock's pen, like his speech, was fluent, and the letters are as easy to read as he found them to write, graceful and simple in sentence formation, unmarked by any straining for effect, the natural outflow from the working of his mind. Those of the later years are increasingly philosophical in tone. The letters will probably be recognized as the finest expression of Whitlock's literary capacity. The journal of the war years has an entirely different quality. It is naturally surcharged with emotion, reflecting the soul-shattering experience of a man who sought the

opportunity for intellectual development, craved a "civilized" existence, and was caught in the blast of the German invasion. His philosophy engulfed by the passions that seethed around him, Whitlock confided to the pages of the journal every passing impression with the intensity of a supersensitive artist forced to attend the martyrdom of everything he loves.

Professor Nevins has achieved a thoroughly admirable success in editorship. He has displayed both restraint and courage. His own introductions serve as necessary background for the chapters in which letters and journal are arranged, and his explanatory footnotes are brief and entirely adequate. He permits the documents to tell the story. On the other hand, he has dared to run the edition to a length which many readers will probably find excessive. There is some redundancy in the letters and a good many trivialities in the journal. But Professor Nevins has reached the correct conclusion that the main historical value of the papers lies in their cumulative effect, which would be lost through careful pruning. Nor has he attempted to protect Whitlock by the excision of passages in the journal betraying an excitement that vitiated judgment and inspired personal criticism of colleagues, in general purely momentary. If taken out of the general setting many passages would be unfair alike to Whitlock and to those with whom he worked; the future historian must be careful of isolated citations. But in the mass the unstudied and emotional frankness of the journal gives to it, as both a personal and historical document, a living quality. From it emerge, beside the personality of Whitlock, two outstanding figures, Herbert Hoover and King Albert. Whatever his later feelings toward Hoover and whether arising from personal misunderstanding or political distrust, the pages of Whitlock's journal attest his profound admiration for the administrative capacity that saved Belgium from starvation. But King Albert is the real hero of the journal, a figure of nobility to whom, consciously and unconsciously, Whitlock never fails to pay tribute and whose personal friendship was evidently for the ambassador the great prize of his diplomatic career.

Yale University. CHARLES SEYMOUR.

Certain Aspects of Land Problems and Government Land Policies. [Supplementary Report of the Land Planning Committee to the National Resources Board. Part VII.] (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1935. Pp. v, 139. 40 cents.)

ONLY the exceedingly industrious student of very recent American economic history will take the pains to wade through this symposium, which, because of its 900-word pages, is a far larger book than the heading of this review would indicate. The lack of an index, for which the analytical table of contents is a poor substitute, injures the report even for reference purposes. The bulk of the material belongs more to the realm of contemporary economic problems and proposals for their solution than to history. It is

excessively, and oftentimes painfully, repetitious, both as between the different authors and within individual sections by the same writer.

Nevertheless, the diligent plodder will be sufficiently rewarded for his industry if he trudges manfully through, and often he will gain more from the tables and maps than from the text. It is a dismal picture that is painted: wasted natural resources, rapacity of land pirates, tragic blundering in government land policies, and a humanity made hopeless by this combination of forces which lured families to farms and range lands unfitted for their use. The lingering diehards who still talk of the Old West as a haven for oppressed laborers should consult the tables compiled by Professor Paul W. Gates on pages 64 to 66. Tracts as large as 4,500,000 acres in a single syndicate and a total of between 200 and 300 million acres (not including railroad lands) in various monopolistic holdings are shown even for the "good old days" before 1890. This, too, was desirable land, which might have been developed by persons of ability and means if speculative prices had not been demanded. The outcome was wide-spread tenancy—a poor substitute for factory servitude. Gates also does much to expose the fable of the unconquerable homesteader, showing how the Federal policies not only did irreparable damage to settlers in the Far West but ruined huge areas of good range land in the process.

The proofreading, as in most government publications, is well done, though two or three errors have been noted. A statement and an appended footnote on page 106 baldly contradict each other. While some sections of the report are well buttressed by documented footnotes, others are sadly deficient in them. A footnote on page 85 should by all means have been inserted in the body of the text on page 78. In fact, the intervening pages might well have been rewritten in the light of information given in the belated footnote.

Kansas State College. FRED A. SHANNON.

Land Systems and Land Policies in Nebraska: A History of Nebraska Land Public Domain and Private Property. By ADDISON E. SHELDON. [Publications of the Nebraska State Historical Society.] (Lincoln: the Society. 1936. Pp. xvi, 383. $3.50.)

THE author rightly says, "This is the only book of its kind in the world", but he exaggerates in calling it a "complete study of land in a definite area". A comprehensive treatment of the various land systems and policies in one of the public land states is needed, and the effort to provide this for Nebraska is distinctly worth while. Unfortunately, all the land systems and policies are not covered, little or no attention being paid to the activities of railroads and land companies. The story of the Indian trust lands is a real contribution, though the allotment question is neglected.

The treatment of the Federal land policies in operation in territorial

Nebraska is the weakest part of the book. A conventional outline of the pre-emption, graduation (which never affected Nebraska), cash sale, and military warrant acts is given, but no analysis is made of the actual entries under them. The distinction between the "two principal methods of acquiring land" in Nebraska, *i.e.*, by pre-emption and by warrant entry, is not sound, as pre-emption claims could be entered with warrants. The oft-repeated generalization that speculators monopolized the best land is applied to eastern Nebraska without supporting evidence. Indeed, although the author mentions the land office records—without the most intensive cultivation of which no "complete" study of land policy is possible—he shows little familiarity with them. No one who has used the entry books would aver that warrants of the act of 1847 were not assignable at all times.

On the Kinkaid Act, the first of the enlarged homestead acts, there are given detailed statistics and long quotations from a 1915 report of the General Land Office wherein appear optimistic but ill-warranted statements as to the success of a policy whose tragic results were shortly to be revealed.

Dr. Sheldon's most valuable chapters deal with Nebraska's state land policies. "Political favoritism", "mal-administration", "defalcation", and "personal loans to friends of the state officers", characterize their operation. There is nothing in this discussion to encourage donating the remaining Federal lands to the states, as was suggested by President Hoover's Land Commission. Nebraska retains a large amount of its education lands and is today one of the greatest proprietors in the country, its lands being leased to tenants.

With its appendix of twenty-two supplementary chapters (including acknowledgments, a bibliographical note, and a postscript) the book contains a mass of ill-digested and poorly integrated material of uneven value. The charts facing page 160, showing the disposition of the public domain in Nebraska, and the statistics in chapter XIII on which it is based are unreliable because the various classifications are not mutually exclusive. Dr. Sheldon's study, however, is always interesting, perhaps nowhere more so than when he relates the conflict between the homesteaders and the cattlemen. It should do much to revive interest in land policy and its history.

Cornell University. PAUL WALLACE GATES.

Are American Teachers Free? An Analysis of Restraints upon the Freedom of Teaching in American Schools. By HOWARD K. BEALE. [Report of the Commission on the Social Studies, The American Historical Association.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1936. Pp. xxiv, 855. $3.50.)

THIS study concerns teachers' colleges and schools below the college level during the period since the World War; Dr. Beale promises that a more extensive "History of Freedom in Teaching" will follow. The volume now published reports on war-time interference with teachers and teaching, on

teachers' oaths, and on the propagandist activities of militarists, "patrioteers", and some business men—including a few rugged individualists and public utility groups. It notes restrictions on the consideration in schools of radical programs, labor problems, government regulation of business, sex, racial problems, wars, religion, and evolution, and recalls the challenging of many textbooks and some magazines as unsuitable for school use. To some extent the volume traverses ground already covered by Dr. Bessie L. Pierce. The imposing of special rules of conduct for teachers, their insecurity of tenure, restraints on their political activity, the barring of racial, religious, and other groups from teaching, the status of teachers of Negroes, and the various administrative, economic, and social factors that mold teachers to conformity are carefully explored.

The study is based not only on wide reading but on correspondence, interviews, and replies to questionnaires. It is thoroughly documented and more than liberally supplied with quotations. The treatment of episodes and instances seems fair; the point of view of the author is, however, never in doubt. He is hostile to restrictions and special interests, sympathetic with "educators who are thinking in terms of social progress" and who are "vitally concerned about relating education to the world's problems". Freedom of teaching is indispensable. "The really important question is: Dare society face the consequences of *not* permitting the teachers of the next generation to be free?" (p. 778). "Organization of teachers is essential" (p. 689). Yet "there is serious question whether an inadequately-trained teacher should be allowed freedom" (p. 714), and it is frankly admitted that freedom, if permitted, will be somewhat abused; the need for competent leadership of teachers' organizations, together with recognition of the heavy responsibilities that accompany freedom, is stressed.

The somewhat querulous cataloguing of many grievances was of course unavoidable as, apparently, was some repetition. The portrait of "the average teacher" (pp. 636 ff.) and the conclusion that, although most teachers are not free, they either do not know it or do not care, are not heartening. Whether or not readers agree with Dr. Beale's point of view and accept his recommendations, whether or not his careful analysis leads, as seems unhappily doubtful, to effective reform, he has presented a thorough and significant description of the status of teachers in our times.

Columbia University. ERLING M. HUNT.

NOTICES OF OTHER RECENT PUBLICATIONS

GENERAL HISTORY

The Middle Class Then and Now. By FRANKLIN CHARLES PALM. (New York, Macmillan, 1936, pp. xiv, 421, $3.50.) This is a tantalizing book that largely fails to come off. Its subject is of prime importance in a world in which class cleavages are widening and the flaccid quality of many current institutions is closely related to the quality of this design for living that we call "middle class". Professor Palm presents 409 pages of data about "the middle class" from Babylonia to the New Deal. The focus of the book is to the popular side, and, in addition to "historical facts", it includes a sprightly array of materials from such sources as the Gilbert and Sullivan operettas and Sinclair Lewis's novels. The reason the book is disappointing is that it is an example of chronological organization without a problem. A subtle and kaleidoscopic concept is dealt with as a kind of factual brick about which items of interest are noted over a time period. The only organizing thread is that of time sequence. Do "objective facts", strung together in chronological sequence and not orientated to the clarification of any focused problem or point of view, make anything but the most elementary contribution to our knowledge? In the present case this procedure of the historian tends to eventuate in another social and economic history of Western Europe and the United States, without opening any fresh vistas into "the middle class" as an urgent concept needing understanding.

ROBERT S. LYND.

Knjiga o Balkanu [Book on the Balkans]. (Belgrade, Balkan Institute, 1937, pp. 347, Dinar 120.) This second publication of the Balkan Institute contains historical articles by Charles Diehl on Constantinople in the Middle Ages, N. Jorga on the Balkans and the Byzantine Empire, and Alexander Brueckner on the religion of the old Slavs. In addition there are many articles on present-day problems in Bulgaria, Greece, and other Balkan countries.

Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. Fourth Series. Volume XIX. (London, the Society, 1936, pp. vii, 284.) Some of the papers published in this volume are noteworthy contributions to historical scholarship. In "The King's Secretary in the Fifteenth Century" Miss J. Otway-Ruthven deals with the office of *secretarius regis* from the reign of Richard II to the early Tudor period, when the principal function of its holders was the custody of the king's signet. Professor T. F. T. Plucknett considers "Some Proposed Legislation of Henry VIII" and publishes the draft of an act of parliament for the erection of a court of justices or conservators of the common weal to sit at Whitehall and enforce "actis ordynancis or statutis penall or popular" enacted since the accession of Henry VII. The draft is in volume 88 of the state papers of Henry VIII in the Public Record Office and appears to have been written about 1534. Professor R. H. George contributes a careful and valuable study of parliamentary elections and electioneering in 1685. Those elections were, as he says, of special interest. "They were the last held prior to the Revolution. They exhibit an unusual effort on the part of the Court to win a sweeping victory. They afford new evidence of political practices then current. They suggest that recent municipal regulations, valuable to the Crown as they were in many

instances, did not always guarantee a Tory triumph. Moreover, they produced a Parliament which, in marked contrast to its predecessors, was thoroughly agreeable to the reigning monarch at the time when it assembled." Other papers in the volume are "English Learning in the Late Twelfth Century" by R. W. Hunt, "The Nature and Use of the Westminster Abbey Muniments" by L. E. Tanner, "English Students at Padua, 1460-75" by Miss R. J. Mitchell, "The Holles Family" by A. C. Wood, and Professor F. M. Powicke's address as president of the society, "Reflections on the Medieval State."

Elements of International Law. By HENRY WHEATON. A Literal Reproduction of the 1866 Edition of Richard Henry Dana, jr., edited by GEORGE GRAFTON WILSON. [The Classics of International Law, edited by James Brown Scott for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.] (New York, Oxford, 1936, pp. xliv, 642, $4.00.) This series signalizes its thirtieth anniversary and the centennial of the publication of Henry Wheaton's *Elements of International Law* by reproducing that great work. The immediate recognition of Wheaton's treatise is shown by the fact that three American and two French editions appeared before his death in 1848. Its lasting value is indicated by the total number of editions that have appeared to date: nine American, six English, five French, two Spanish, one Italian, one Chinese, and two Japanese. The edition here selected is that of 1866, the first edited by Richard Henry Dana, jr., whose notes have come to be recognized as having a value second only to the text itself. This volume includes sketches of Wheaton and Dana by the editor, a list of the editions of Wheaton, a new index of authors, periodicals, and documents, and a revision of Dana's subject index. PHILIP C. JESSUP.

Western Civilization in the Near East. By HANS KOHN. Translated by E. W. Dickes. (New York, Columbia University, 1936, pp. xi, 329, $3.50.) Professor Kohn is well equipped to analyze the transformation of the Near East in recent years. He has lived and traveled widely in the region and has devoted many years to the study of its people and their environment. Students of nationalism and imperialism will recall his previous volumes in which, among other matters, the ideological ferment in Islam and the growing political and national consciousness in western Asia were noted. In the present volume, which is a translation of a work published in German in 1934, the author has performed, and performed well, a far more difficult task. He has portrayed a society in transition, brought under notice the quickening of life in a world which has been static for centuries, and found the dynamic force in the all-pervasive "western" civilization. The book opens with a brief description of the physical environment, of the role played by the Levant in the past, and of the easy-going, traditional, and stagnant civilization which is being undermined. Nationalism, secularism, and industrialization are then shown to be the factors in Western civilization which have proved most potent in awakening the dormant and docile East. Intellectuals and a rising middle class have found in European civilization the means of combatting dominance by Europeans. The author shows how nationalism has rallied the masses to the support of the middle class and intellectuals in Turkey, in Egypt, and, to a lesser extent, elsewhere in the Near East; how the temporal state is supplanting the theological one, notably in Turkey; and, in what is perhaps the best chapter in the book, how the policies of economic nationalism are employed to create a "national" economy. OSCAR I. JANOWSKY.

Abdul-Hamid, le sultan rouge. By GILLES ROY. Préface du Colonel Lamouche. (Paris, Payot, 1936, pp. 242, 18 fr.) M. Roy presents a vivid and interesting

account of the personal life of Abdul Hamid II, the last significant Ottoman sultan. A reliable narrative of his formative years and of salient personal episodes in the background of events important historically will be acceptable in this day of demand for the psychological element in biography. The question of reliability is answered in part by the bibliographical list of a hundred books: of these four fifths are in French and the remainder in English; none reveal observations or collected information printed in German, Italian, or other Western languages; none are in Turkish; and only a small minority are written by Turks in whole or in part. To these incomplete materials are to be added the author's residence in Turkey (mostly not at Constantinople but at Smyrna) from 1895 to 1908 and the testimony of Col. Léon Lamouche, trustworthy historian of Turkey, that M. Roy "collected all the tales, all the rumors concerning the reigning sovereign, and has thus been able to animate his story with numerous and sometimes piquant anecdotes". If all this does not provide the measure of assurance which can be felt about the personal character of such well-documented monarchs as Henry VIII, Louis XIV, or Queen Victoria, it possesses a far higher degree of probability than can be had for most Oriental sovereigns; abundant material from the hand or over the signature of such personages is conspicuously lacking. M. Roy does not provide notes, references, or index. The nine plates are well selected and executed. The lively style introduces conversation, much of which must be fictive, though it is not implausible in view of the known facts. Admitting all strictures, the book is well worth the historian's perusal. A. H. Lybyer.

Force or Reason: Issues of the Twentieth Century. By Hans Kohn. (Cambridge, Harvard University, 1937, pp. 167, $1.50.) This brief and stimulating analysis of some of the historical and philosophical factors in the struggle between democracy and dictatorship is warmly recommended to the average reader and to the professional teacher of history and political science. The author discusses the cult of force, the dethronement of reason, and the crisis of imperialism.

A Catalogue of the Epstean Collection on the History and Science of Photography and its Applications, especially to the Graphic Arts. With a Foreword by Edward Epstean and an Introductory Note by Hellmut Lehmann-Haupt. (New York, Columbia University, 1937, n. p., $1.50.) This catalogue of the collection of photography and photomechanical processes of reproduction presented to Columbia University in 1933 by Mr. Edward Epstean is in fact a bibliography of the subject of photography. The collection itself is comprehensive and well rounded and is particularly interesting historically, as it contains some of the earliest important titles in the history of photography, such as Daguerre's *Historique et description des procédés du daguerreotype et du diorama,* published in 1839. Many of the titles in its section on technical evolution, while no longer of value as technical handbooks, are useful as historical source material. There is an extremely good collection of periodicals in which much of the early material on photography appeared and of valuable reprints from these periodicals. The history of photography covers just about one hundred years, and its story is the story of a major part of the development of historical documentation as we understand it today. Roger Howson.

Articles

Erling M. Hunt. The Spirit and Letter of Scholarship. *Soc. Educ.,* May.
James Westfall Thompson. The Library of Gibbon the Historian. *Library Quar.,* July.
Ferdinando D'Antonio. Guerra e pace nel pensiero di Kant. *N. Riv. Stor.,* Jan.

HERMANN KANTOROWICZ. Savigny and the Historical School of Law. *Law Quar. Rev.*, July.

FELICE BATTAGLIA. L'opera storica dei fratelli [R. W. and A. J.] Carlyle. *Riv. Stor. Ital.*, June.

BENEDETTO CROCE. Studii sulla storiografia: La certezza storica. *Critica*, July.

RENÉ GROUSSET. Les études historiques et l'orientalisme. *Rev. Hist.*, Jan.

PAUL H. JOHNSTONE. In Praise of Husbandry [agricultural literature from Hesiod's *Works and Days* to the early eighteenth century]. *Agricultural Hist.*, Apr.

D. GERNEZ. Lucas Janszoon Wagenaer: A Chapter in the History of Guide-Books for Seamen. *Mariner's Mirror*, Apr., July.

HERBERT HEATON. Heckscher on Mercantilism. *Jour. Pol. Ec.*, June.

KENNETH S. LATOURETTE. The Christian Missionary Movement of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. *Cath. Hist. Rev.*, July.

FREDERICK B. ARTZ. European Civilization 1815-1850: Some Unfinished Business. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Sept.

GAVIN B. HENDERSON. The Pacifists of the Fifties. *Ibid.*

PIERRE RENOUVIN. Histoire de la guerre, 1914-1918. *Rev. Hist.*, Jan.

PHILIP E. MOSELY. The Post-War Historiography of Modern Bulgaria. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Sept.

C. H. MCILWAIN. The Reconstruction of Liberalism. *For. Affairs*, Oct.

ANCIENT HISTORY

T. R. S. Broughton

Food in Early Greece. By KENTON FRANK VICKERY. [Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences.] (Urbana, University of Illinois, 1936, pp. 97, $1.00.) This is an industrious collection of materials relating to foodstuffs in the prehistoric Aegean world. The results are not very exciting because of the nature of our information, and one looks forward with more interest to the continuation of the work, promised in the preface, into historical times. M. I. FINKELSTEIN.

Herodot, der erste Geschichtschreiber des Abendlandes. By MAX POHLENZ. [Neue Wege zur Antike.] (Leipzig, Teubner, 1937, pp. 221, 9.20 M.) Nineteenth century criticism of Herodotus was dominated by an essentially negative approach, which took the form of an invidious comparison with Thucydides. In recent years a fresh impulse, directed toward a more positive evaluation of the achievement of the "Father of History", has been given to Herodotean studies. The efforts of scholars have been turned to an analysis of the positive elements in his creation viewed against the background of the intellectual, literary, and religious amalgam of Hellenic culture in transition from Ionia to Attica in the middle of the fifth century B.C. Pohlenz has written the most ambitious of these recent studies, but, while he has brought to bear upon the subject a profound knowledge of the cultural milieu, he has not succeeded in liberating himself from modern categories and from the clichés of contemporary German historiography. He has elevated to the position of a central theme in Herodotus the struggle for freedom of the Hellenic-European David against the Barbarian-Asiatic Goliath (conceived as a hereditary enmity between East and West), culminating in the Persian Wars; and he has read into Herodotus a political ideal—Athenian naval supremacy within the framework of a Hellenic nation inspired by a Panhellenic consciousness. In thus ascribing to Herodotus a nationalistically orientated consciousness and a politico-historical pragmatism and relegating to a subordinate position the Persian motif and the ethic-metaphysical-religious motif of Herodotus, Pohlenz has presented an in-

terpretation of the first historian of the West which is fitted to the co-ordinating mold of modern preconceptions but will not stand the critical test of time.

MEYER REINHOLD.

GENERAL ARTICLES

FR. W. FREIHERR VON BISSING. Das angebliche Weltreich der Hyksos. *Arch. f. Orientf.*, XI, nos. 5-6.

L. BORCHARD. Der Kronungstag Ramses V: Drei neue Beispiele von Mondmonatsnamen aus der Zeit der 20. Dynastie. *Zeitsch. f. Ägypt. Sprache*, LXXIII, no. 1.

E. CAVAIGNAC. La maison de Šubbiluliuma. *Rev. Hittite et Asian.*, July, 1936.

Id. Ras Shamra et l'empire hittite. *Ibid.*

E. O. FORRER. Kilikien zur Zeit des Hatti-Reiches. *Klio*, XXX, no. 2.

THOMAS LENSCHAU. Forschungen zur griechischen Geschichte im VII und VI Jahrhundert v. Chr. *Philologus*, XCI, no. 4.

A. PIGANIOL. Deux notes sur l'expédition de Sicile. (1. Les Adonies de 415 av. J. C. 2. Le Trôgilos.) *Rev. Études Grec.*, Jan.

W. WALLACE. The Egyptian Expedition and the Chronology of the Decade 460-450 B.C. *Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc.*, LXVII.

GLENN R. MORROW. The Murder of Slaves in Attic Law. *Class. Philol.*, July.

ROBERT H. PFEIFFER. Hebrews and Greeks before Alexander. *Jour. Bibl. Lit.*, June.

A. PIGANIOL. La date du troisième incendie de Delphes. *Rev. Études Anc.*, Apr.

P. JOUGUET. Les débuts du règne de Ptolémée Philométôr et la sixième guerre syrienne. *Rev. Philol.*, July.

GIUSEPPINA VAGGI. Siria e Siri nei documenti dell' Egitto greco-romano. *Aegyptus*, Jan.

MARIO ATTILIO LEVI. Roma nella storia del mondo antico. *Riv. Stor. Ital.*, Mar.

K. LATTE. The Origin of the Roman Quaestorship. *Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc.*, LXVII.

H. MATTINGLY. The Property Qualifications of the Roman Classes. *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XXVII, no. 1.

W. W. BUCKLAND. Civil Proceedings against ex-Magistrates in the Republic. *Ibid.*

F. E. ADCOCK. Lesser Armenia and Galatia after Pompey's Settlement of the East. *Ibid.*

T. R. S. BROUGHTON. A Significant Break in the Cistophoric Coinage of Asia. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, Apr.

FREDERIK POULSEN. Die Römer der republikanischen Zeit und ihre Stellung zur Kunst. *Antike*, XIII, no. 2.

LOTHAR WICKERT. Zu Caesars Reichspolitik. *Klio*, XXX, no. 2.

M. CARY. The Municipal Legislation of Julius Caesar. *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XXVII, no. 1.

RONALD SYME. Who was Decidius Saxa? *Ibid.*

ULRICH WILCKEN. Octavian after the Fall of Alexandria. *Ibid.*

FRANZ MILTNER. Augustus' Kampf um die Donaugrenze. *Klio*, XXX, no. 2.

RONALD SYME. Pamphylia from Augustus to Vespasian. *Ibid.*

M. P. CHARLESWORTH. Flaviana. *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XXVII, no. 1.

E. T. SALMON. Trajan's Conquest of Dacia. *Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc.*, LXVII.

R. M. GEER. Second Thoughts on the Imperial Succession from Nerva to Commodus. *Ibid.*

HENRI SEYRIG. Note sur Hérodien, prince de Palmyra. *Syria*, XVIII, no. 1.

GEORGE MACDONALD. "Britannia statim omissa". *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XXVII, no. 1.

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK. The Genius of Mithraism. *Ibid.*

HUGH LAST. The Study of the Persecutions. *Ibid.*

TENNEY FRANK. Notes on Roman Commerce. *Ibid.*

M.-TH. SCHMITTER. Subsericae Vestes. *Rev. Arch.*, Apr.

A. W. BYVANCK. Notes Batavo-romaines. *Mnemosyne*, V, no. 1.

HOWARD COMFORT. Emphyteusis among the Papyri. *Aegyptus*, Jan.

A. GRENIER. Chronique gallo-romaine. *Rev. Études Anc.*, Apr.

G. R. DAVIDSON. The Avar Invasion of Corinth (with a supplementary note by Tibor Horáth). *Hesperia*, VI, no. 2.

L. P. KIRWAN. Studies in the Later History of Nubia. *An. Arch. and Anthrop.*, XXIV, nos. 1-2.

Archaeological Articles

Simone Corbiau. New Finds in the Indus Valley. *Iraq*, IV, no. 1.

R. Horn. Archäologische Funde. *Jahrb. Deutsch. Arch. Inst.*, LI, nos. 3-4.

G. Contenau. Les fouilles en Asie Occidentale. *Rev. Arch.*, Apr.

Report on Excavations and Trips of Exploration in Oriental Lands. *Arch. f. Orientf.*, XI, nos. 5-6.

E. A. Speiser. New Discoveries at Tepe Gawra and Khafaje. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, Apr.

W. Lamb. Excavations at Kuzura near Sandıklı, Vilayet Afyon-Karahisar. *Jahrb. Deutsch. Arch. Inst.*, LI, nos. 3-4.

Hetty Goldman. Excavations at Gözlü Kule, Tarsus, 1936. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, Apr.

John Garstang. Explorations in Cilicia: The Neilson Expedition, Preliminary Report. *An. Arch. and Anthrop.*, XXIV, nos. 1-2.

André Parrot. La troisième campagne de fouilles à Mari. *Syria*, XVIII, no. 1.

L. H. Vincent. Les fouilles d'et-Tell. *Rev. Biblique*, Apr.

Ernst F. Weidner. Die Reliefs der assyrischen Könige. *Arch. f. Orientf.*, XI, nos. 5-6.

M. Rostovtzeff. The Squatting Gods in Babylonia and at Dura. *Iraq*, IV, no. 1.

D. B. Harden. The Pottery from the Precinct of Tanit at Salammbo, Carthage. *Ibid.*

Einar Gjerstad. Studies in Archaic Greek Chronology: II, Ephesus. *An. Arch. and Anthrop.*, XXIV, nos. 1-2.

E. Bethe. Das archaische Delos und sein Letoon. *Hermes*, LXXII, no. 2.

T. Leslie Shear. Excavations in the Athenian Agora. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, Apr.

Elizabeth Pierce Blegen. News Items from Athens. *Ibid.*

J. G. Milne. The Origin of Certain Copies of Athenian Tetradrachms. *Iraq*, IV, no. 1.

Katharine M. Edwards. Report on the Coins found in the Excavations at Corinth during the Years 1930-1935. *Hesperia*, VI, no. 2.

M. Z. Pease. A Well of the Late Fifth Century at Corinth. *Ibid.*

Erwin R. Goodenough. Symbolism in Hellenistic Jewish Art: The Problem of Method. *Jour. Bibl. Lit.*, June.

K. A. Neugebauer. Kohlenbecken aus Clusium und Verwandtes. *Röm. Mitteil.*, LI, nos. 3-4.

Eugénie Strong. Terra Mater or Italia? *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XXVII, no. 1.

Valentin Müller. The Roman Basilica. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, Apr.

S. Fuchs. Deutung, Sinn und Zeitstellung des Wiener Cameo mit den Fruchthornbüsten. *Röm. Mitteil.*, LI, nos. 3-4.

Literary and Epigraphical Articles

O. R. Gurney, Gerhard Meier, Ernst F. Weidner. Keilschrifttexte nach Kopien von T. G. Pinches. *Arch. f. Orientf.*, XI, nos. 5-6.

Albrecht Götze. Remarks on the Epigraphical Material found at Tarsus in 1936. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, Apr.

Giuseppe Furlani. L'apologia di Hattušiliš di Hatti. *Aegyptus*, Jan.

I. J. Gelb. Queen Pudu-Hepa. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, Apr.

David M. Robinson. A New Fragment of the Fifth-Century Athenian Naval Catalogues. *Ibid.*

W. Kendrick Pritchett. A Decree of the Year of Koroibos. *Am. Jour. Philol.*, July.

P. Guillon. Borne thasienne d' un lieu de culte de Zeus. *Rev. Arch.*, Apr.

K. v. Fritz. Herodotus and the Growth of Greek Historiography. *Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc.*, LXVII.

W. Kroll. Ciceros Rede für Plancius. *Rhein. Mus.*, LXXXVI, no. 2.

N. W. De Witt. Epicurean Contubernium. *Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc.*, LXVII.

Lily Ross Taylor. On the Chronology of Cicero's Letters to Atticus, Book XIII. *Class. Philol.*, July.

T. R. S. Broughton. Was Sallust fair to Cicero? *Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc.*, LXVII.

Karl Vretska. Der Aufbau des Bellum Catilina. *Hermes*, LXXII, no. 2.

Glanville Downey. The Architectural Significance of the Use of the Words *Stoa* and *Basilike* in Classical Literature. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, Apr.

C. B. Welles. A Yale Fragment of the *Acts of Appian*. *Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc.*, LXVII.

Adolf Wilhelm. Papyrus Tebtunis 33. *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XXVII, no. 1.
H. I. Bell. A Latin Registration of Birth. *Ibid.*
Eugene Schweigert. Inscriptions in the Epigraphical Museum (Corinth). *Hesperia*, VI, no. 2.
J. G. C. Anderson. An Imperial Estate in Galatia. *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XXVII, no. 1.
Ludovico Laffranchi. Nota sulla data LHA delle monete alessandrine di Gallieno. *Aegyptus*, Jan.
Dimiter Detschev. Ein neues Militärdiplom aus Dacia Porolissensis. *Klio*, XXX, no. 2.
Franz Cumont. St. George and Mithra "The Cattle-Thief". *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XXVII, no. 1.
Norman H. Baynes. The Death of Julian the Apostate in a Christian Legend. *Ibid.*

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

G. C. Boyce

Business in the Middle Ages. By Summerfield Baldwin. [Berkshire Studies in European History.] (New York, Henry Holt, 1937, pp. 106, $1.00.) Within the compass of a hundred pages it is difficult to present adequately a picture of the business of making a living in the Middle Ages, even as an introduction for college students, which is all this book pretends to be. The author disclaims for it any basis of original research, but he has succeeded in presenting the results of other scholars' contributions in a style that is often refreshing and always agreeable. In the first section, on getting a living, he has woven together his material in such a manner as to interest those for whom the book is primarily intended. The second section, on increasing production, is equally good, and while the author acknowledges his great debt to Pirenne, he has not failed to preserve an independent attitude toward certain of that master's views. The third section, on exchanging surpluses, is a little disappointing. Too much emphasis is placed upon the Jews as moneylenders; the role of Venice is depicted as almost solely dependent upon the slave trade and the supposed successes of the Fourth Crusade; there is nothing on the business acumen of the Italians in the penetration of the Near East; the importance of the fairs of Champagne has been slighted. Perhaps necessary compression and elimination are responsible for some of these seeming defects, but a few erroneous impressions are given which cannot be thus accounted for. An uninformed reader will almost certainly be led to believe that Gerbert brought the cipher into Western Christian Europe from Arab Spain (p. 19), that the virgate was uniformly eight times the extent of the bovate and therefore 120 acres (p. 28). The tonnage of medieval ships is greatly underestimated, and the use of swift galleys is not mentioned (p. 85). Investments in partnerships were not limited to a single voyage (p. 96). Yet despite these faults the book will serve its purpose well.

Eugene H. Byrne.

Viking Enterprise. By Sven Axel Anderson. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law.] (New York, Columbia University, 1936, pp. 164, $2.25.) The most distinctive feature of Dr. Anderson's study is his point of view, which is that of an economic rather than a political or military historian. While he admits that the Northern tribes were much addicted to warfare, he emphasizes the fact that the Vikings were also engaged in constructive operations, such as trade and settlement. In Eastern Europe, where the environment was not favorable to raids of the conventional type, the pirate found it quite easy to drop his customary activities for those of the merchant. In his account of the Viking operations in Western Europe the author is on ground that has been tilled many

times, and he has not been able to add very much that is in any sense novel. On the other hand, his discussion of conditions in the home lands is very informing and quite adequate. The same can be said of his chapter on ships, organization, and tactics. The most satisfactory part of the work is the chapter on operations in Russia and Constantinople, though one cannot help regretting that Dr. Anderson, since he is here dealing with a subject that is little known, has not developed it in greater detail. LAURENCE M. LARSON.

Urkundenbuch der Reichsabtei Hersfeld. Volume I, part 1. By HANS WEIRICH. (Marburg, N. G. Elwert, 1936, pp. 208, 8.50 M.) This is the first fascicle of the cartulary of the monastery of Hersfeld to appear under the aegis of the Historical Commission for Hesse and Waldeck. It had been hoped to publish the cartulary in 1927 in celebration of the twelve hundredth anniversary of the monastery, but many delays, including the death of the first editor, Dr. Karl Hörger, prevented earlier publication. One hundred and nineteen charters are included in this fascicle. The first is the forgery purporting to be of the year 771/772 by which Charlemagne granted to the monks the right to elect their abbot and withdrew the monastery from the jurisdiction of the diocesan bishop. The last is a grant of lands made to the monastery by Mathilda, widow of Count Meginhard of Felsberg in the year 1100. The editing has been skillfully and carefully done. In all cases manuscript sources are indicated, the location of facsimile copies where they exist, and modern editions of charters. This information is generally followed by a description of the manuscript. Where two copies of a manuscript are extant with important textual variations, both texts are given. Nine of the charters included are labeled forgeries. In this evaluation Dr. Weirich follows the weight of learned opinion, noting disagreement where it exists. The Historical Commission of Hesse and Waldeck is to be congratulated on the publication of this careful piece of work. HELEN ROBBINS BITTERMANN.

Le domaine royal sous les premiers capétiens, 987-1180. By WILLIAM MENDEL NEWMAN. (Paris, Sirey, 1937, pp. xxii, 276, 35 fr.)

Catalogue des actes de Robert II. By WILLIAM MENDEL NEWMAN. (*Ibid.*, pp. xxxii, 209, 25 fr.) Mr. Newman has done an important and extremely difficult piece of work. As he says, earlier writers have tended to confuse the royal domain with the region in which the king had effective political authority. But while the king was the most powerful lord in the Isle de France, the whole Isle de France was not royal domain. Also "le domaine est non seulement extensif mais sa profondeur varie d'un endroit à l'autre". The revenue which the king drew from a village in which he had lands, tolls, and rights of justice were much greater than that furnished by a village in which he had only a toll. Yet both were part of the domain. All maps of the domain made hitherto are misleading because they ignored these principles. Mr. Newman has tried to give a more accurate picture by constructing tables indicating the domains of each of the early Capetian kings. These tables show where the domain was and what it was. The rights which the king had in each locality are carefully enumerated. A separate series of tables deals with the "ecclesiastical domain", that is, with the bishoprics and abbeys in which the king had *regalia* and some control of elections. Readers of earlier works will be surprised by certain omissions in these lists, but Mr. Newman has adequate reasons for them. A work of this sort cannot be complete, especially for the period before Philip I. Yet the author has given us a solid nucleus of facts which will explain many phases of early French history. In the *Catalogue des actes de Robert II* Mr. Newman has made many corrections in Pfister's earlier list. The latter's untenable theory of the dating

of Robert's acts is revised, fifteen new acts are added, and several documents accepted by Pfister are branded as forgeries. The technique of the whole book is in the best tradition of French scholarship. JOSEPH R. STRAYER.

An Ecclesiastical Barony of the Middle Ages: The Bishopric of Bayeux, 1066-1204. By SARELL EVERETT GLEASON. [Harvard Historical Monographs.] (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1936, pp. 123, $1.00.) This is an important study, describing with clarity and precision the realities of feudalism in one of the most famous Continental baronies of medieval times. In examining Bayeux the author has followed Professor Stenton's suggestion that a study of local units—especially the honor and the barony—is the requisite antecedent to a full understanding of feudal society. The ecclesiastical position of Bayeux makes it somewhat difficult, at times impossible, to distinguish categorically the bishop as ecclesiastic from the bishop as baron. That the bishop had true baronial status there is little doubt, for his holding meets every requirement to be described as a barony: it was extensive in respect to size, it was a source of great wealth, twenty knights were owed as *servitium debitum* to the crown, and its lord enjoyed wide legal privileges (after 1147 even that of using the sworn inquest in his court). The mighty Odo was "by all odds the most outstanding figure among the bishops of Bayeux of the Middle Ages". During his turbulent career he did much to dissipate the revenues of the barony, and his successors had the onerous task of retrieving the heritage that he had let slip away. These bishops were all men of wealth, owing their appointments to family connections and the grace of the crown. Usually they had been trained in the king's chapel, "the nursery of bishops", a school in which the lessons learned were not quickly forgotten, and had followed a veritable *cursus honorum* before being chosen for high office. It is significant that Bayeux offers no case of the career open to talent. If the bishops enjoyed many privileges, they also had many duties and on the whole showed themselves to be capable men.

The Autobiography of Giraldus Cambrensis. Edited and translated by H. E. BUTLER, with an Introductory Chapter by C. H. WILLIAMS. (London, Jonathan Cape, 1937, pp. 368, 15*s*.) The bulk of this narrative is a translation of sections drawn principally from Gerald's *De rebus a se gestis* and *De jure et statu Meneuensis ecclesiae*.

The Place of the Reign of Edward II in English History: Based upon the Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford in 1913. By T. F. TOUT. [Second edition, revised throughout by Hilda Johnstone.] (Manchester, University Press, 1936, pp. xx, 375. 21*s*.) This revision of Tout's well-known work by his sister-in-law, Professor Hilda Johnstone, was manifestly a labor of love. She wisely refrained from alterations in the text such as might have destroyed "the imprint of the writer's personality" and tried to put herself "within the writer's mind" and make only "those additions or alterations which he would have made himself if he had lived". This was a difficult and delicate undertaking, but Professor Johnstone had the benefit of notes and queries with which Tout had covered the margins and flyleaves of his own copy of the book, of his *Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England*, and of familiarity with his opinions and methods gained during many years of intimate scholarly association with him. The book was written nearly twenty-five years ago, and it was desirable to bring it abreast of recent scholarship in the text and the notes, as Professor Johnstone has done. The form of the lists of officials under Edward II (in Appendix II) has been improved, and additions and corrections have been made.

Liber procuratorum nationis Anglicanae (Alemanniae) in Universitate Parisiensi. Ediderunt CAROLUS SAMARAN, ÆMILIUS A. VAN MOÉ, auxiliante Susanna Vitte. [Auctarium chartularii Universitatis Parisiensis. Tomus III.] (Paris, Henri Didier, 1935, pp. xiv, 892, 300 fr.) In 1894 and 1897 Heinrich Denifle and Émile Chatelain published the first volumes of the proctors' *Liber* as a supplement to their edition of the great cartulary for the University of Paris. A transcription of the manuscripts covering the late fifteenth century had been made for them, but lack of funds and pressure of other duties forced the editors to suspend publication of materials dealing with the years following 1452. This third volume includes the proctors' notes for the years 1466 to 1492 and opens a rich storehouse of information to students of fifteenth century history and culture. Though written by officers of the English-German nation, the book is a record of university, faculty, and municipal life—in fact, of European life—rather than merely a detailed account of the vicissitudes of the English-German masters. The volume reflects throughout the high standards of scholarship one would expect from its distinguished editors. The publisher is to be commended for having it conform in size and general appearance to the earlier volumes.

Das Heerwesen in der Zeit des freien Soldnertums. Part I, *Das Heerwesen der schweizer Eidgenossenschaft.* By EUGEN VON FRAUENHOLZ. [Entwicklungsgeschichte des deutschen Heerwesens.] (Munich, Beck, 1936, pp. x, 215, 9 M.) The author finds a true picture of contemporary history through his study of the development, organization, ideals, training, and fortunes of the Swiss military system to the middle of the sixteenth century. Over half of the volume contains documentary material, parts of which are here published for the first time.

ARTICLES

J. S. P. TATLOCK. Interpreting Literature by History. *Speculum,* July.

JOSIAH COX RUSSELL. Medieval Population. *Soc. Forces,* May.

LUISE MANZ. Der Ordo-Gedanke: Ein Beitrag zur Frage des mittelalterlichen Ständegedankens. *Vierteljahrs. f. Soz.- und Wirtschaftsgesch.,* XXXIII.

KARL BRANDI. Grundlegung einer deutschen Inschriftenkunde. *Deutsches Archiv f. Gesch. Mittelal.,* I, no. 1.

AUGUSTO BECCARIA. Il ritorno della scienza classica nel primo medioevo. *Riv. Stor. Ital.,* Mar.

M. CHAUME. En marge des croisades bourguignonnes d'Espagne. *An. Bourgogne,* Mar.

RENÉ CROZET. Le voyage d'Urbain II en France (1095-1096) et son importance au point de vue archéologique (with map). *An. Midi,* Jan.

NELLY ERTL. Diktatoren frühmittelalterlicher Papstbriefe. *Archiv f. Urkundenf. und Quellenkunde Mittelal.,* N. F., I, no. 1.

REINHARD FRAUENFELDER. Die Klosterbibliothek von Allerheiligen zu Schaffhausen. *Zentralbl. f. Bibliothekswes.,* May.

DIETRICH VON GLADISS. Die Schenkungen der deutschen Könige zu privatem Eigen (800-1137). *Deutsches Archiv f. Gesch. Mittelal.,* I, no. 1.

P. S. LEICHT. Gli "Honorati" della "divisio Ducatus Beneventani". *Studi Medievali,* VIII, nos. 1-2.

JOHN M. MCBRYDE. A Curious Blunder in Some Modern English Translations of King Alfred's Version of Bede's History. *Mod. Lang. Notes,* June.

C. MARTIN. Hippolyte de Rome et Proclus de Constantinople. *Rev. Hist. Eccléc.,* Apr.

H. ST. L. B. MOSS. The Economic Consequences of the Barbarian Invasions. *Ec. Hist. Rev.,* May.

KARL OTTO MÜLLER. Eine neue Handschrift der Lex Romana Visigotorum (Breviarium Alaricianum) in churrätischer Schrift aus der Zeit um 800. *Zeitsch. Savigny-Stiftung,* LVII, Germ. Abt.

ULRICH STUTZ. Zur Herkunft von Zwing und Bann. *Ibid.*

Id. Ausgewählte Kapitel aus der Geschichte der Eigenkirche und ihres Rechtes. *Ibid.*, Kan. Abt., XXVI.

PERCY ERNST SCHRAMM. Ordines-Studien II: Die Krönung bei den Westfranken und den Franzosen. *Archiv f. Urkundenf. und Quellenkunde Mittelal.*, N. F., I, no. 1.

E. SCHWARTZ. Ueber die Bischofslisten der Synoden von Chalkedon, Nicaea und Konstantinopel. *Abhand. Bayer. Akad. Wissensch.*, N. F., no. 13.

LUCIO VASSALI. Rapporti fra regni barbarici e impero nella II metà del V secolo. *N. Riv. Stor.*, Jan.

P. L. LEICHT. La corporazione delle arti nelle sue origini e nel primo sorgere del comune. *Riv. Stor. Ital.*, June.

OTTO VEHSE. Bistumsexemtionen bis zum Ausgang des 12. Jahrhunderts. *Zeitsch. Savigny-Stiftung*, LVII, Kan. Abt., XXVI.

N. DENHOLM-YOUNG. Les noblesses. En remontant le passé de l'aristocratie anglaise: le moyen âge. *An. Hist. Éc. et Soc.*, May.

HANS-WALTER KLEWITZ. Cancellaria: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des geistlichen Hofdienstes. *Deutsches Archiv f. Gesch. Mittelal.*, I, no. 1.

JOHANNES RAMACKERS. Sur l'histoire de l'élection de l'évêque Hugues d'Angoulême, 1149. *Moyen Age*, Oct., 1936.

PERCY ERNST SCHRAMM. Der König von Frankreich: Wahl, Krönung, Erbfolge und Königsidee vom Anfang der Kapetinger (987) bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. *Zeitsch. Savigny-Stiftung*, LVII, Kan. Abt., XXVI.

HANS SPANKE. La poesie lyrique des troubadours. *Studi Medievali*, VIII, nos. 1-2.

GIFFORD DAVIS. The Incipient Sentiment of Nationality in Mediaeval Castile: The *Patrimonio Real*. *Speculum*, July.

RAYMOND DE ROOVER. Aux origines d'une technique intellectuelle: La formation et l'expansion de la comptabilité à partie double. *An. Hist. Éc. et Soc.*, Mar., May.

P. ELMAN. The Economic Causes of the Expulsion of the Jews in 1290. *Ec. Hist. Rev.*, May.

THEODOR GOERLITZ. Das flämische und das fränkische Recht in Schlesien und ihr Widerstand gegen das sächische Recht. *Zeitsch. Savigny-Stiftung*, LVII, Germ. Abt.

FREDERICK COYNE HAMIL. Presentment of Englishry and the Murder Fine. *Speculum*, July.

RUDOLF HIS. Untersuchungen zu den älteren Rechtsquellen Ostfrieslands. *Zeitsch. Savigny-Stiftung*, LVII, Germ. Abt.

LEO W. KEELER. The Dependence of R. Grosseteste's *De Anima* on the *Summa* of Philip the Chancellor. *New Scholasticism*, July.

HUBERT KROPPMANN. Ehedispensübung und Stauferkampf unter Innozenz IV: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des päpstlichen Ehedispensrechtes. *Abhand. Mitt. u. Neuren Gesch.*, LXXIX.

PAUL LEHMANN. Auf der Suche nach alten Texten in nordischen Bibliotheken. *Zentralbl. f. Bibliothekswes.*, June.

D. O. LOTTIN. Le libre arbitre chez Godefroid de Fontaines. *Rev. Néoscol. Philos.*, May.

VICTOR MARTIN. Comment s'est formée la doctrine de la supériorité du concile sur le pape: I. La tradition canonique avant le grand schisme d'Occident [cont.]. *Rev. Sci. Relig.*, Apr.

THEODOR MAYER. Die Entstehung des "modernen" Staates im Mittelalter und die freien Bauern. *Zeitsch. Savigny-Stiftung*, LVII, Germ. Abt.

B. MENDL. Les derniers Přemyslides: La fin d'une dynastie slave. *Rev. Hist.*, Jan.

JOSIAH COX RUSSELL. Social Status at the Court of King John. *Speculum*, July.

DOMINIQUE SALMAN. Note sur la première influence d'Averroès. *Rev. Néoscol. Philos.*, May.

JOSEF SOMOGYI. Ein arabischer Bericht über die Tartaren im "Ta'rīḫ al-Islām" von ad-Dahabī. *Islam*, May.

HANS VON VOLTELINI. Der Gedanke der allgemeinen Freiheit in den deutschen Rechtsbüchern. *Zeitsch. Savingy-Stiftung*, LVII, Germ. Abt.

LYNN THORNDIKE. Date of the Translation by Ermengaud Blasius of the Work on the Quadrant by Profatius Judaeus. *Isis*, Mar.

Id. Faust and Johann Virdung of Hassfurt. *Ibid.*

Id. The Debate for Precedence between Medicine and Law: Further Examples from the Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Century. *Romanic Rev.*, July, 1936.

Georges de Lagarde. Marsile de Padoue et Guillaume d'Ockham [cont.]. *Rev. Sci. Relig.*, Apr.

Henry S. Lucas. Edward III and the Poet Chronicler John Boendale. *Speculum*, July.

Hans Niedermeier. Francesco Petrarca und seine Sozialideen. *Vierteljahrsch. f. Soz.- und Wirtschaftsgesch.*, XXX, no. 1.

Gaines Post. Petrarch and Heraclitus Once More. *Speculum*, July.

Richard Scholz. Marsilius von Padua und die Genesis des modernen Staatsbewusstseins. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, CLVI, no. 1.

Johan Schreiner. Retterboten av 1308 [the royal decree of 1308]. *Hist. Tidsskr.* (Nor.), 1937, no. 1.

Natale Carotti. Un politico umanista del quattrocento: Francesco Barbaro. *Riv. Stor. Ital.*, June.

W. Vogel. La Hanse d'après les publications récents. *Rev. Hist.*, Jan.

Ernest Wickersheimer. Sur la syphilis aux XV^e^ et XVI^e^ siècles. *Humanisme et Ren.*, Apr.

Documents

Paul Kehr. Aus den letzten Tagen Karls III. *Deutsches Archiv f. Gesch. Mittelal.*, I, no. 1.

Fritz Weigle. Die Briefe Rathers von Verona. *Ibid.*

R. R. Darlington. The Last Phase of Anglo-Saxon History. *History*, June.

George L. Haskins. Three Early Petitions of the Commonalty. *Speculum*, July.

Wilfried Krallert. Ein unbekanntes Diplom Lothars III. für die S. Salvatorkirche in Ficarolo. *Mitteil. Österr. Inst. f. Geschichtsf.*, L, nos. 3-4.

Walter Wache. Eine Sammlung von Originalbriefen des 12. Jahrhunderts im Kapitelarchiv von S. Ambrogio in Mailand. *Ibid.*

Charles Johnson. The Reconciliation of Henry II with the Papacy: A Missing Document. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, July.

G. O. Sayles. The Sources of Two Revisions of the Statute of Gloucester, 1278. *Ibid.*

Francis J. Carmody. Brunetto Latini's *Tresor:* Latin Sources on Natural Science. *Speculum*, July.

Marcel Françon. Rondeaux du MS. 402 de Lille. *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, June.

Martin Grabmann. Handschriftliche Forschungen und Funde zu den philosophischen Schriften des Petrus Hispanus, des späteres Papstes Johannes XXI. *Sitz. Bay. Akad. Wissen.*, 1936, no. 9.

Édouard Poncelet. Herstal et Vivegnis: Souveraineté territoriale, règlements de seigneurie, chartes d'affranchissement. *Bull. Acad. Roy. Belg.*, CII, no. 2.

Maurice Yans. Un testament de bourgeois liégeois du XIII^e^ siècle, 8 juin, 1281. *Ibid.*, no. 1.

Woodburn O. Ross. A Brief *Forma Predicandi*. *Mod. Philol.*, May.

Sarah Favale. Siena nel quadro della politica viscontea nell'Italia centrale. *Bull. Senese Stor. Pat.*, VII, no. 4.

Heinrich Finke. Die angeblich gefälschte Korrespondenz der aragonischen Könige mit Walram Scheiffart von Merode. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVII, no. 1.

Paul Lehmann. Skandinavische Reisefrüchte [search for medieval mss.]. *Nordisk Tidskr. för Bok- och Biblioteksväsen*, XXIV, no. 2 (cont.).

Lynn Thorndike. Two more Alchemical Manuscripts. *Speculum*, July.

Id. Introduction and Canon by Dalmatius to Tables of Barcelona for the Years 1361-1433 A.D. *Isis*, Mar.

Id. The Secrets of Hermes. *Ibid.*, May.

André Bossuat. Philippe le Bon et l'abbaye de Luxeuil: Une clause du traité d'Arras. *An. Bourgogne*, Mar.

R. Weiss. The Earliest Account of the Murder of James I of Scotland. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, July.

A. R. Myers. Parliamentary Petitions in the Fifteenth Century. *Ibid.*

Josef Koch. Cusanus-Texte: Vier Predigten im Geiste Eckharts. *Sitz. Heidelber. Akad. Wissen.*, 1936/37, no. 2.

Roberto Ridolfi. Una lettera inedita di Amrigo Vespucci sopra il suo terzo viaggio. *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, 1937, no. 1.

E. Staedler. Die Urkunde Alexanders VI. zur westindischen Investitur der Krone Spanien von 1493. *Archiv f. Urkundenf. und Quellenkunde Mittelal.*, N. F. I, no. 1.

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The British Empire

R. L. Schuyler

The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names. By Eilert Ekwall. (New York, Oxford University, 1936, pp. xlvii, 520, $5.00.) As late as 1910 Henry Bradley wrote of English place-name studies (*Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, Oxford, 1910, p. 7): "Unfortunately nearly everything that has been written on the subject is worthless." Since that time a series of excellent monographs has appeared, particularly those in the Survey by the English Place-Name Society, the thirteen volumes of which now cover somewhat less than a third of England. This new work dealing with all England, by Professor Ekwall, a veteran in this field of research, is based upon a vast mass of original, independent collections of early forms. The only previous work of comparable scope, James B. Johnston's *The Place-Names of England and Wales* (London, 1915), which was received respectfully when it appeared, is now far outclassed. Ekwall brings to his material an expert ability in interpretation. For instance, *York* is traced beyond the popular etymology *eoforwic*, "boar village", to a Celtic tree name, *eburos*, "yew". He does not force his etymologies, realizing, no doubt, that the soundness of an etymology varies in inverse proportion to its ingenuity: thus *Carlisle* is dismissed with the sentence, "The history of the name offers many obscure points." A work of this sort cannot be definitive, since further old forms will constantly be unearthed, but the study under review represents the highest point yet reached. Ekwall's introduction contains an interesting discussion of the problems involved, and throughout the alphabet are valuable entries on the formative elements. The compression is remarkable, allowing a wealth of material to be included. These are raw materials (since the alphabetical arrangement permits no more) that may be utilized in later historical studies on the character of the early population, the interests of the inhabitants, social conditions, etc. The *Dictionary* can be depended on as a trustworthy summation of the information now available about English place names. Allen Walker Read.

Was the Failure of the Spanish Armada due to Storms? By J. Holland Rose. (New York, Oxford University, 1937, pp. 40, $1.25.) This paper from the *Proceedings* of the British Academy, Volume XXII, has been published in advance.

Robert Loder's Farm Accounts, 1610-1620. Edited by G. E. Fussell. [Camden Third Series.] (London, Royal Historical Society, 1936, pp. xxxi, 207.) These accounts of an enterprising and "improving" seventeenth century English farmer throw some new light on methods of open-field agriculture in his day. The evidence indicates that tradition was less potent than has often been supposed and that there was considerable scope for individual initiative.

Henrietta Maria. By CAROLA OMAN. (New York, Macmillan, 1936, pp. xiii, 360, $5.00.) This is the most interesting of the lives of Queen Henrietta Maria yet written. For the first time the personality of the queen is described with discrimination as well as vividness. Although her political activities are not neglected, the author gives most attention to her as a wife, a mother, and a disconsolate widow. The lively style of the author and her reputation as a novelist should not be allowed to cast doubt upon the general veracity of the work, except for the description of the queen's death, which is imaginary. It may have been tempting, but it was really unnecessary to invent some last thoughts for Henrietta Maria. Usually a more critical attitude is adopted, as in the description of the scene at Whitehall just before Charles set out for Westminster to arrest the five members. It is noteworthy, however, that Miss Oman omits Henrietta Maria's angry exhortations to the hesitating king to seize the offending members by force, perhaps because she thought the authority was weak. Yet the words the queen is alleged to have used seem characteristic, even to the mixture of French and English: "Alle, Poltron, Go, pull these rogues out by the ears, or never see my face more!" (Lawrence Echard, *History of England,* II [1718], 280). There are some rather surprising statements here and there—that Robert Sidney belonged to a faithful royalist family (p. 211), that the second duke of Buckingham was far inferior in ability to his father (p. 228), and that General Monck was known to his troops as "Old Tom" (p. 264). GODFREY DAVIES.

Letters and Papers relating to the Irish Rebellion between 1642-46. Edited by JAMES HOGAN. [The Irish Manuscripts Commission.] (Dublin, Stationery Office, 1936, pp. xi, 216, 10*s.* 6*d.*) The documents here published are taken from a volume of the Rawlinson Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library. It appears from preliminary entries that it was copied from records of the Irish Council in Dublin Castle in 1664, and it is almost certain that the compilation was made at the initiative of the Earl of Anglesey, who was something of a pamphleteer and historian and was deeply interested in the history of the rebellion and civil war in Ireland in the 1640's. Most of the documents in the collection were written in 1642. In the words of the editor, they show "the desperate nature of the struggle then in progress and how near British authority came to disappearing from the greater part of the country".

A Review of the Jewish Colonists in Barbadoes in the Year 1680. By WILFRED S. SAMUEL. (London, Purnell, 1936, pp. 125, 10*s.* 6*d.*) The author's thesis is that the Jews played a leading part in the peopling of this important British Caribbean colony and that their social and economic role has not as yet been fully appreciated. Immigration records, census returns, militia muster rolls, and tombstones amply demonstrate the presence of large numbers of Hebrews at this early date, while tax lists and wills give specific data respecting their position in the community. Most of them were, naturally, merchants, but some engaged in planting. Both groups were subject to discriminations and disabilities. They were, however, deemed "less pestilential" than the Quakers and readily made their way. It is interesting to note that the Nidhé Israel Congregation has had an unbroken existence from the seventeenth century to our own time.

LOWELL JOSEPH RAGATZ.

The Colossus of Roads: A Life of John Loudon McAdam. By ROY DEVEREUX. (New York, Oxford University, 1936, pp. xi, 184, $3.00.) This little book provides a popular and interesting story of the life of McAdam. The pictures are effective. The family letters give us a feeling of intimate acquaintance with the

man himself. His early business ventures in New York City and in Scotland might have been dealt with at greater length if information exists. At many points, indeed, we feel that the author has not done much to uncover facts about his hero except through family sources. McAdam will be remembered through the centuries because his name has been written into the language. As early as 1824 London sought and secured "Macadamized" roads. Metcalf, Telford, and McAdam all improved English roads, but the greatest of them was McAdam. He worked out a formula for road building that has been only slightly improved up to our day. Whilst Telford had built heavy roads, in many cases beyond the needs of traffic, McAdam was accused of constructing roads that were too light for heavy duty. Whilst Telford believed in paving, McAdam would have none of it. Both agreed in major matters, for instance, that only uniform broken stones be used, with no binding material such as clay, sand, or gravel. Apart from the top surfacing with tar, we have made little or no improvement over McAdam's methods. Our cement highways are inferior in that they are more rigid. Indeed, McAdam liked to build his roads right over a swamp or bog, for then he had a perfect cushion. Without such work as his the quickening of the economic life of Britain would have been delayed after the Napoleonic wars. There would have been no stagecoach era (1820-36). The turnpikes would have lingered longer to curb the growing demand for railroads. All in all, the author has brought out many essentials in the situation. We only wish we could regard his book as definitive. N. S. B. GRAS.

A Constitutional History of British Guiana. By Sir CECIL CLEMENTI. (New York, Macmillan, 1937, pp. xxii, 546, $7.25.) Few parts of the British Empire have known a stormier political history than British Guiana. This is because its three component parts, Essequibo, Berbice, and Demerara, were all originally Dutch colonies, and, upon annexation, the Dutch legal system was retained as a means of reconciling the planters to their new status. British immigrants, who found themselves denied the traditional rights of Englishmen, clamored loudly and incessantly for reform. Attempts at compromise pleased neither group and resulted in a constitution unlike any other in the Empire. At length, following basic changes in 1891 and again in 1928, a balance appears to have been struck, and high hopes are now entertained for stability. The author was for nine years colonial secretary of the colony and headed its government on three occasions. Well fortified by this experience, he presents a highly complex subject in simple, pleasing style and has made a significant contribution to the literature of colonial government. Its importance transcends its subject matter, as it forms a case study in modern imperialism and illustrates dramatically the dangers inherent in a premature grant of representative institutions and in vesting financial control in elected legislatures not charged with administrative responsibilities. It is based throughout on source material and maintains the highest standards of craftsmanship. The appendix includes some twenty key documents. There is, oddly enough, no index. LOWELL JOSEPH RAGATZ.

Revolt on the Clyde: An Autobiography. By WILLIAM GALLACHER. (New York, International Publishers, pp. xviii, 301, $3.00.) This book is only in slight measure an autobiography. Those aspects alone of the author's personal career that pertain to his leadership of the Clyde workers during the World War are detailed, except for a brief account of his conversion to communism in 1920 and his parliamentary candidatures culminating in his election in 1935 as the only communist member of parliament. "Revolt" is too strong a term for wartime unrest in western Scotland. That it never became applicable Gallacher believes

was because of the planlessness of the leaders, including himself, though they considered themselves revolutionaries. Of the industrial conflict of 1919 he writes: "We were carrying on a strike when we ought to have been making a revolution. . . . A rising was expected. A rising should have taken place. The workers were ready and able to effect it; the leadership had never thought of it". Perhaps genuine revolutionaries were always a small minority on the Clyde. But left wing doctrines, particularly industrial unionism, had made much headway before 1914, especially among engineering, shipbuilding, and allied trades, the principal industries of the region. This, together with the detailed control by the state imposed upon these essential war industries, explains in part why the Clyde was the most disturbed section of Britain during the years 1914-19. After the Russian revolutions opposition to the "capitalistic" war itself became widespread. In 1918, says Gallacher, no "patriot" dared attempt a public speech in Glasgow. It was, nevertheless, industrial and not political questions that were the paramount concern of the dominant workshop committees and their central body, the Clyde Workers' Committee, of which Gallacher was chairman. The activities of these committees constitute the main theme of this well-written book. FRANCES E. GILLESPIE.

Is It Peace? A Study in Foreign Affairs. By GRAHAM HUTTON. (New York, Macmillan, 1937, pp. 364, $2.50.) The distinctive feature of this straightforward and intelligent account of postwar international politics and diplomacy by the assistant editor of the *Economist* (London) is its analysis and criticism of recent British policy. The author is impressed by the "relative insignificance of purely economic factors in the formation of foreign policy in the short run—that is, in a decade or less", and he is convinced that "any attempt to prove that British foreign policy during the last five years had been actuated by considerations of economic 'imperialism' would come to grief".

ARTICLES

LAWRENCE E. TANNER. Westminster Abbey and the Coronation Service. *History,* Mar.

L. G. WICKHAM LEGG. The History of the Coronation Service. *Nineteenth Cent.,* May.

OSWYN A. R. MURRAY. The Admiralty [cont.]. *Mariner's Mirror,* Apr.

RICHARD PARES. The Economic Factors in the History of the Empire. *Ec. Hist. Rev.,* May.

C. W. C. OMAN. The Personality of Henry the Eighth. *Quar. Rev.,* July.

A. G. DICKENS. The Marriage and Character of Archbishop Holgate. *Eng. Hist. Rev.,* July.

BEATRICE REYNOLDS. Elizabethan Traders in Normandy. *Jour. Mod. Hist.,* Sept.

JOHN U. NEF. Prices and Industrial Capitalism in France and England, 1540-1640. *Ec. Hist. Rev.,* May.

C. LOOTEN. Un avocat de l'église anglicane: Richard Hooker (1554-1600) of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity (1592-3 et 1597). *Rev. Hist. Ecclés.,* July.

A. F. POLLARD. Hayward Townshend's Journals. *Bull. Inst. Hist. Research,* Feb., June.

DONALD O. WAGNER. The Common Law and Free Enterprise: An Early Case of Monopoly. *Ec. Hist. Rev.,* May.

G. F. JAMES and J. J. SUTHERLAND SHAW. Admiralty Administration and Personnel, 1619-1714 [concl.]. *Bull. Inst. Hist. Research,* Feb.

G. E. FUSSELL. Animal Husbandry in Eighteenth Century England. *Agricultural Hist.,* Apr.

FLORENCE E. DYER. The Ship-Money Fleet. *Mariner's Mirror,* Apr.

CHARLES F. MULLETT. Some Aspects of Religion and Politics in England, 1660-1767. *Southwestern Soc. Sci. Quar.,* June.

H. N. FIELDHOUSE. Bolingbroke's Share in the Jacobite Intrigue of 1710-14. *Eng. Hist. Rev.,* July.

ALLEN WALKER READ. Projected English Dictionaries, 1755-1828. *Jour. Eng. and Ger. Philol.,* Apr., July.

CHARLES METZGER. An Appraisal of Shelburne's Western Policy. *Mid-America*, July.
F. E. WHITTON. The Great Siege of Gibraltar, 1779-1783. *Blackwood's Mag.*, July.
D. BONNER SMITH. More Light on Bligh and the *Bounty*. *Mariner's Mirror*, Apr.
A. S. TURBERVILLE. The Younger Pitt and the House of Lords. *History*, Mar.
F. T. H. FLETCHER. Montesquieu and Penal Law Reform in England. *Univ. Toronto Quar.*, July.
CHARLES RIST. Le cours forcé en Angleterre, 1797-1821: Thornton, Ricardo, le Bullion Report et la théorie quantitative de la monnaie. *Rev. Hist. Éc. Soc.*, 1936-37, no. 1.
WALTER RONALD CODD. Nova Scotian Trade during the War of 1812. *Can. Hist. Rev.*, June.
GEORGE MACMUNN. The British Legion in Spain a Hundred Years Ago. *Nineteenth Cent.*, June.
C. K. WEBSTER. The Accession of Queen Victoria. *History*, June.
W. FORBES GRAY. Carlyle and John Forster: An Unpublished Correspondence. *Quar. Rev.*, Apr.
JAMES J. ALLAN. The Strategic Principles of Lord Lytton's Afghan Policy. *Jour. Royal Central Asian Soc.*, July.
ERWIN HÖLZLE. Lloyd George im Weltkrieg. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, CLVI, no. 1.
A. L. KENNEDY. Sir Austen Chamberlain: A Great Conservative Foreign Secretary. *Quar. Rev.*, July.
ALGERNON CECIL. Lord Baldwin. *Ibid.*
G. G. PHILLIPS. Since the Statute of Westminster. *Cam. Law Jour.*, VI, no. 2.
MRS. W. GARLAND FOSTER. British Columbia Indian Lands. *Pacific Northwest Quar.*, Apr.
N. A. M. MACKENZIE. Canada and the Treaty-Making Power. *Can. Bar Rev.*, June.
VINCENT C. MACDONALD. The Canadian Constitution Seventy Years After. *Ibid.*
HERBERT VERE EVATT. The Judiciary and Administrative Law in Australia. *Ibid.*, Apr.
W. F. CRAVEN. An Introduction to the History of Bermuda. *William and Mary Coll. Quar. Hist. Mag.*, Apr.

DOCUMENTS

A. H. DODD, ed. Two Welsh Catholic *Émigrés* discuss the Accession of James I. *Bull. Board Celtic Stud.*, May.
MRS. R. L. ARKELL. George I's Letters to his Daughter. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, July.
Outbreak of the Papineau War in Lower Canada: Edward S. Goodnow to George V. Edwards, Nov. 7, 1837. *Moorsfield Antiq.*, May.

FRANCE

S. B. Clough

Ch. Dupont-White, économiste et publiciste français, 1807-1878: Sa vie, son oeuvre, sa doctrine. Par DANIEL VILLEY. Tome I, *La jeunesse de Dupont-White et ses travaux économiques, 1807-1851.* Préface de M. H. Noyelle. [Bibliothèque d'histoire contemporaine.] (Paris, Alcan, 1936, pp. li, 677, 75 fr.) Because an undeserved oblivion has for some time been threatening to engulf the writings of Dupont-White, historians should welcome this exhaustive study of the man by a capable young French scholar with especial satisfaction. It is not illogical, however, that Dupont-White should be revived in our own days of economic nationalism and state totalitarianism, for in many respects he was an ancestor of some of our present dominant political and economic concepts. He considered the state to be the one collective organ to which all citizens might appeal for aid and the main agency for alleviating social injustice. The events of 1848 strengthened these beliefs, and the state came to be regarded as the "highest expression of human nature, the incarnation of reason, morality, and general, national interest". This first of three volumes on the life and doctrines of Dupont-White includes a complete bibliography of his works, a review of the literature about him, and an account of his intellectual life to 1851. The two

succeeding volumes will conclude the biography and present a systematic analysis of Dupont-White's theories.

ARTICLES

M. JARYC. Bibliographies et instruments de travail. *Rev. Hist. Mod.*, Apr.

HENRI HAUSER. Histoire de France de 1498 à 1660. *Rev. Hist., Bull. Crit.*, Apr.

MARC BLOCH and PAUL LEUILLOT. List of Books and Articles on the Economic History of France. *Ec. Hist. Rev.*, May.

GABRIEL-LOUIS JARAY. La politique américaine de François I et la prise de possession de la "Nouvelle France" par Jacques Cartier. *Rev. Ques. Hist.*, May.

SUMMERFIELD BALDWIN. Jean Bodin and the League. *Cath. Hist. Rev.*, July.

G. PAGÈS. Autour du "Grand Orage": Richelieu et Marillac, deux politiques. *Rev. Hist.*, Jan.

P. E. HÜBINGER. Fénelon als politischer Denker. *Hist. Jahrb.*, July.

L. ANDRÉ. Le Maréchal de la Mothe-Houdancourt. *Rev. Hist. Mod.*, Jan.

A. LAJUSAN. Nationalisme et pacifisme dans les lettres françaises au XVIII[e] siècle. *Bull. Soc. Hist. Mod.*, May.

MICHEL LHÉRITIER. Le despotisme éclairé de Frédéric II à la Révolution française. *Bull. Internat. Committee Hist. Sci.*, July.

PHILIPPE SAGNAC. L'idée de la nation en France, 1788-1789. *Rev. Hist. Pol. et Const.*, Jan.

G. CLÉMENT-SIMON. La loge du "Contrat Social" sous le règne de Louis XVI. *Rev. Ques. Hist.*, May.

A. BAHU. Les paysans de la région de Clermont-de-l'Oise à la fin de l'Ancien Régime. *An. Hist. Rév. Fr.*, May.

G. LEFEBVRE. Le mouvement des prix et les origines de la Révolution française. *Ibid.*, July.

C. E. LABROUSSE. Quelques observations sur la lecture des courbes économiques. *Ibid.*

SHELBY T. MCCLOY. Charity Workshops for Women, Paris, 1790-95. *Soc. Serv. Rev.*, June.

P. NICOLLE. Le mouvement fédéraliste dans l'Orne en 1793. *Ibid.*, May.

L. DE CARDENAL. À propos du fédéralisme. *Ibid.*

L. LECLERC. La politique et l'influence du club de l'Hôtel Massiac. *Ibid.*, July.

A. MATHIEZ. Le gourvernement révolutionnaire. *Ibid.*, Mar.

L. DE CARDENAL. Les sociétés populaires du 9 thermidor à la fermature du Club des Jacobins. *Rév. Fr.-Rev. Hist. Contemp.*, June, 1937.

JULES A. BAISNÉE. The French Clergy in the Nineteenth Century. *Cath. Hist. Rev.*, July.

G. BLONDEAU. Les dernières années de l'Empire dans le Comté de Nice (1812-1814). *Rév. Fr., Rev. Hist. Contemp.*, June.

HOWARD MUMFORD JONES and DANIEL AARON. Notes on the Napoleonic Legend in America. *Fr.-Am. Rev.*, Summer.

ANDRÉ SEGRETAIN. Thiers et le comité de défense de Paris, 18-28 août, 1870. *Rev. Hist.*, Apr.

A. MILLERAND. Les premiers jours de la Troisième République. *Rev. Hist. Pol. et Const.*, Jan.

ALEXANDRE RIBOT. L'alliance franco-russe. *Rev. Hist. Guerre Mond.*, July.

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT. France and the Outbreak of the World War. *For. Affairs*, Apr.

JOSEPH BARTHÉLEMY. La présidence du conseil. *Rev. Hist. Pol. et Const.*, Jan.

LOUIS DUMONT-WILDEN. Le nationalisme. *Ibid.*, Apr.

F. SCHALK. Die antiromantische Denken in modernen Frankreich. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, May.

G. BEYERHAUS. Die konservative Staatsidee in Frankreich und ihr Einfluss auf die Geschichtswissenschaft. *Ibid.*, Apr.

DOCUMENTS

M.-L. PUECH-MILHAU, ed. An Interview on Canada with La Salle in 1678. *Can. Hist. Rev.*, June.

Autour du 19 janvier [1867]: Tiers parti et opposition républicaine. Fragments inédits de la correspondence d'Allain-Targé. *Rev. Hist.*, Jan.

L'histoire contemporaine dans les manuels scolaires. *Rev. Hist. Guerre Mond.*, July.

Germany

E. N. Anderson

Der Bundschuh: Die Bauernverschwörungen am Oberrhein. By Willy Andreas. (Cologne, Schaffstein, 1936, pp. 63, 40 M.) This is a brief, popular account of the peasant risings in Germany from 1493 to 1517. The author has attempted no more than to tell the story of the *Bundschuh* in its various manifestations as simply and clearly as possible. Professor Andreas is a master in the field, and, if there is little that is new in the book, it will still serve a useful purpose in summarizing the results of the most recent research for those students whose interest in the subject is not sufficient to carry them through the more detailed works of Albert Rosenkranz and Günther Franz or the author's own learned monographs.

Wallace K. Ferguson.

Friedrich Kapp, 1824-1884: Ein Lebensbild aus den deutschen und den nordamerikanischen Einheitskämpfen. By Edith Lenel. [Königsberger historische Forschungen.] (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1935, pp. viii, 179, 9 M.) Friedrich Kapp, a conspicuous figure among the German liberals who emigrated to the United States after the collapse of the Revolution of 1848, presents a curious enigma. After a sojourn of twenty years in New York, during which he built up a successful legal practice, he returned to Germany to join the National Liberal party and to make his peace with the Bismarckian Empire. Why he did so is the focal psychological problem of his life, and of this Fräulein Lenel, whose otherwise scholarly and illuminating study represents the first systematic effort at a biography of this colorful personality, offers no satisfactory solution. To say (p. 83) that Kapp first became conscious of his German nationality in the United States is merely to state the final upshot of his experience, scarcely to explain it. Kapp's own constant preoccupation with the problem of German immigration in its larger aspects (he wrote the first history of German immigration into the United States and from 1866 to 1870 was commissioner of immigration in New York) gave him a settled conviction that while a peasant, artisan, or merchant could succeed, a German intellectual could never be completely at home in the United States (p. 100). Perhaps it was his saturation with German philosophic idealism in the form of Ludwig Feuerbach's religious philosophy that had the effect of insulating his mind; certain it is that there was no positive response to the American cultural environment. At all events, the entire problem requires a more rigorous and critical analysis than that given to it in this study. By far the most attractive portion of Dr. Lenel's study is devoted to Kapp's youth, to a series of portraits of academic types represented in the family from which he sprang, and to his experience in German universities before 1848.

Walter L. Dorn.

Zur preussischen Geschichte. By W. Dilthey. [W. Diltheys Schriften, XII.] (Leipzig, Teubner, 1936, pp. x, 212.) The author of these essays was one of the most influential teachers in prewar Germany and was the greatest exponent of *Geistesgeschichte*. His writings have a biographical interest which justifies the publication of these rather ephemeral studies of Schleiermacher, Stein, Hardenberg, Humboldt, Gneisenau, and Scharnhorst. All of these were intended for popular consumption, as was likewise the sketch on the *Preussische Jahrbücher*, the journal with which Dilthey was closely connected. Even though they were written between 1861 and 1872, they can still be read with pleasure. The rich-

ness of Dilthey's mind is apparent in them as in his larger works. The last study in this volume, "Das allgemeine Landrecht", dates from his old age and is composed of extensive selections from his unpublished manuscripts. Apart from their scholarly value the essays reveal Dilthey as an active *kleindeutsch* liberal who revered manly vigor and was able by way of his *Geistesgeschichte* method to harmonize his liberalism with an admiration for Frederick the Great and Bismarck's German Empire.

Locarno: Eine Dokumentensammlung. Edited by Dr. FRITZ BERBER, with an Introduction by Joachim von Ribbentrop. [Deutsche Hochschule für Politik, Berlin; Institut für auswärtige Politik, Hamburg.] (Berlin, Junker und Dünnhaupt, 1936, pp. x, 408, 8.50 M.) In October, 1925, the major powers met at Locarno and agreed to protect each other from the scourge of war. Here is the German "White Book" on the subject. It consists of some seventy-six official documents, treaties, speeches, interviews, and letters. With a bristling introduction by Ambassador Joachim von Ribbentrop, the book appears to be the official German apologia for Germany's denunciation of Locarno. The thesis is simple: Germany can no longer recognize the validity of the Locarno understandings because they have been liquidated by the Franco-Russian Mutual Assistance Pact, "destructive of the moral spirit of the agreements". Moreover, the Locarno treaties provided for the demilitarization of the Rhineland, which was to be followed by the disarmament of France and all Europe. Now that Germany has again won sovereignty and equality among nations ("over which we shall never again permit a discussion"), Locarno is ended, and it is the hope of the new Germany that a Western Locarno, directed against Russia, will be created. Ambassador Ribbentrop warmly praises the historical objectivity of Dr. Berber. An attempt has been made to present both sides of the question, but the selection and placing of documents are calculated to bolster the German case. The unprejudiced observer who reads between lines and documents will tend to come to one conclusion: Germany denounced the Locarno treaties because they were an obstacle to the *Machtpolitik* of the present German regime. The embarrassing fact remains that the initiative for Locarno came from the German foreign minister, Stresemann, whose ideology of reconciliation has been vehemently repudiated by the new German government. Locarno is dead because the spirit of Machiavelli has again triumphed over that of Grotius in another graveyard duel. LOUIS LEO SNYDER.

ARTICLES

L. WAEBER. Constitutions synodales inédites du Prévôt Schneuwly [concl.]. *Zeitsch. f. Schweiz. Kirchengesch.*, 1937, no. 2.

W. A. LIEBESKIND. Une source glaronnaise pour l'histoire de l'Académie de Genève au 17. siècle. *Ibid.*

MORRIS ROSENBERG. Die kirchenpolitischen Ideen Augustin Kellers [cont.]. *Ibid.*

ADOLF GASSER. Landständische Verfassungen in der Schweiz. *Ibid.*, no. 1.

HERBERT SCHÖNEBAUM. Der Versuch einer Volkslehre bei Johann Amos Comenius. *Ungar. Jahrb.*, 1937, nos. 1-3.

GUSTAV AUBIN. Aus der Entstehungsgeschichte der nordböhmischen Textilindustrie. *Deutsches Archiv f. Landes- und Volksf.*, I, no. 2.

JOHANN WEIDLEIN. Über die deutschen Kolonisten der ersten Auswanderungsperiode, 1722-1726, in Ungarn. *Ibid.*

HANS BARON. Religion and Politics in the German Imperial Cities during the Reformation [cont.]. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, July.

L. GROSS. Die Reichspolitik der Habsburger. *Neue Jahrb. f. Deutsche Wissen.*, 1937, no. 3.

EBERHARD KESSEL. Der russisch-österreichische Feldzugsplan, 1761. *Forsch. Brandenburg. und Preuss. Gesch.*, XLIX, no. 1.

HEINRICH RÉZ. Die geistigen Strömungen in den ungarischen und deutsch-ungarischen Zeitschriften, 1800-1820. *Ungar. Jahrb.*, 1937, nos. 1-3.

FRITZ VALJAVEC. Die Anfänge der Monumenta Germaniae Historica und die ungarische Geschichtsforschung. *Ibid.*

HELMUT KLOCKE. Die Donauschwaben: Grundzüge des gesellschaftlichen Gefüges einer deutschen Volksgruppe. *Ibid.*

MAXIMILIAN CLAAR. Zwanzig Jahre habsburgischer Diplomatie in Rom, 1895 bis 1915: Persönliche Erinnerungen. *Berl. Monatsh.*, July.

FRIEDRICH STIEVE. Die geographische Lage Italiens und Deutschlands und ihr Einfluss auf die Geschichte. *Ibid.*

JUSTUS HASHAGEN. Ranke in neuer geistesgeschichtlichen Beleuchtung. *Zeitsch. f. Deutsche Geistesgesch.*, III, nos. 1-2.

HEINRICH RITTER v. SRBIK. Zur gesamtdeutschen Geschichtsauffassung: Ein Versuch und sein Schicksal. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, CLVI, no. 2.

HERMANN AUBIN. Zur Erforschung der deutschen Ostbewegung. *Archiv f. Landes- und Volksf.*, I, no. 1.

THEODOR SOMMERLAD. Rankes Werk und sein Gegenwartswert. *Thüring.-Sächs. Zeitsch. f. Gesch. und Kunst*, XXIV, nos. 1-2.

THEODOR STEINBÜCHEL. Die Philosophie Friedrich Nietzsches, ihre geistesgeschichtliche Situation, ihr Sinn und ihre Wirkung. *Zeitsch. f. Deutsche Geistesgesch.*, III, nos. 1-2.

WILHELM KAPP. Die Elsässer in Frankreich. *Deutsches Archiv f. Landes- und Volksf.*, I, no. 2.

W. GRAU. Geschichte der Judenfrage. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, CLVI, no. 2.

WALTER KÖHLER. Der deutsche Reichsgedanke bei den Humanisten und Luther. *Neue Jahrb. f. Deutsche Wissen.*, 1937, nos. 1-2.

HANS HALLMANN. Die kurmärkischen Stände zur Zeit Joachims II. *Forsch. Brandenburg. und Preuss. Gesch.*, XLIX, no. 1.

GUSTAV BOSSERT. Die Reformation in Dekanatsbezirk Böblingen. *Blätter f. Württemberg. Kirchengesch.*, 1936, nos. 3-4.

R. H. FIFE. Humanistic Currents in the Reformation Era. *Ger. Rev.*, 1937, no. 2.

ERICK MASCHKE. Die Hanse in der polnischen Geschichtsschreibung. *Altpreuss. Forsch.*, XIV, no. 1.

ROLAND SEEBERG-ELVERFELDT. Das Deutschtum Libaus zur Zeit der Zugehörigkeit des Amtes Grobin zu Preussen, 1560-1609. *Ibid.*

LUDWIG ANDRESEN. Die Entwickelung des deutschen Volkstums in Schleswig in der Zeit von 1544-1721. *Archiv f. Landes- und Volksf.*, I, no. 1.

HORST GOTTHARD OST. Die Besiedlung der nördlichen Grenzmark und des südöstlichen Hinterpommerns im 16. Jahrhundert. *Ibid.*

E. O. KOSSMANN. Forschungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Tuchmacherei in Mittelpolen. *Deutsches Archiv f. Landes- und Volksf.*, I, no. 2.

MAX CASPAR. Johannes Kepler als geistlicher Liederdichter. *Blätter f. Württemberg. Kirchengesch.*, XL, nos. 3-4.

F. BEHREND. Die Spangenbergs. *Zeitsch. f. Kirchengesch.*, CLVI, no. 1.

KURT FORSTREUTER. Die ersten Juden in Ostpreussen. *Altpreuss. Forsch.*, XIV, no. 1.

HEINRICH SIEVEKING. Die Glückstädter Guineafahrt im 17. Jahrhundert: Ein Stück deutscher Kolonialgeschichte. *Vierteljahr. f. Soz.- und Wirtschaftsgesch.*, XXX, no. 1.

ROLAND SEEBERG-ELVERFELDT. Die preussischen Stände und Polen unter Kurfürst Georg Wilhelm bis zum Tode König Sigismund III, 1620-1632. *Altpreuss. Forsch.*, XIII, no. 1.

HANS BERNHARD MEYER. Neue Ergebnisse der Anton-Möller-Forschung. *Ibid.*, XIV, no. 1.

WILHELM FRENZEN. Germanienbild und Patriotismus im Zeitalter des deutschen Barock. *Deutsche Vierteljahr. f. Literaturw's. und Geistesgesch.*, XV, no. 2.

HANS SARING. Tatarische Gesandschaften an den kurbrandenburgischen Hof. *Forsch. Brandenburg. und Preuss. Gesch.*, XLIX, no. 1.

CARL HINRICHS. Die Bildungsreise des jungen Friedrich Wilhelm I in die Niederlande und die preussischen Absichten auf die Statthalterschaft im Jahre 1700. *Ibid.*

Hans Bütow. Der Schwedter Hofbildhauer Georg Mattarnovy bis 1714. *Ibid.*

D. F. Fritz. Hedinger und der württembergische Hof. *Blätter f. Württemberg. Kirchengesch.*, XL, nos. 3-4.

Leo Schrade. Johann Sebastian Bach und die deutsche Nation. *Deutsche Vierteljahr. f. Literaturwis. und Geistesgesch.*, XV, no. 2.

Wm. J. Rose. Lelewel as Historian. *Slav. Rev.*, Apr.

Th. Schieder. Prinz Eugen und Friedrich der Grosse im gegenseitigen Bilde. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, CLVI, no. 2.

Otto Kern. Friedrich August Wolf als Hallischer Professor. *Thüring.-Sächs. Zeitsch. f. Gesch. und Kunst*, XXIV, nos. 1-2.

N. Margue. Die Entwicklung des Luxemburger Nationalgefühls von 1780 etwa bis heute. *Deutsches Archiv f. Landes- und Volksf.*, I, no. 2.

Wilhelm Wühr. Der Bayreuther Prozess gegen die gegenrevolutionäre Agentur Ludwigs XVIII von Frankreich, 1801-1804. *Zeitsch. f. Bayer. Landesgesch.*, X, no. 1.

Ernst Rudolf Huber. Volksheer und Verfassung: Ein Beitrag zu der Kernfrage der Scharnhorst-Boyenschen Reform. *Zeitsch. f. Gesamte Staatswis.*, XCVII, no. 2.

Erna Schulz. Friedrich Lists Geschichtsauffassung. *Ibid.*

Ernst Rudolf Huber. Deutsche Wehrordnung und Verfassung bis zum Ende des Absolutismus. *Ibid.*, no. 1.

H. Klemm. Joh. Christ. Blumhardts theologischer Werdegang. *Zeitsch. f. Kirchengesch.*, CLVI, no. 1.

Alfred Pokrandt. Die Rückwanderung deutscher Kolonisten aus Süd- und Neuostpreussen nach 1815 und ihre Ansiedlung in Ostpreussen. *Altpreuss. Forsch.*, XIV, no. 1.

Manfred Laubert. Das Übergreifen der Posener polnischen Aufstandsversuche vom Winter 1845-6 nach Westpreussen. *Ibid.*, XIII, no. 2.

Eduard Winter. Kardinal Schwarzenberg und Domprediger J. E. Veith. *Zeitsch. f. Deutsche Geistesgesch.*, III, nos. 1-2.

Charlotte Jolles. Theodor Fontane und die Ära Manteuffel. *Forsch. Brandenburg. und Preuss. Gesch.*, XLIX, no. 1.

O. Hesnard. Philosophe et partisan: Fr. Th. Vischer, 1848-1870. *Rev. German.*, XXVII, no. 4.

Walther Thomas. Die königliche Garnisonschule zu Dresden (1817-1893) mit einem Überblick über das Garnison- und Militärschulwesen in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert. *Zeitsch. f. Gesch. Erziehung und Unterrichts*, XXVI, nos. 1-2.

Gerhardt Giese. Volk, Staat, Erziehung bei den Pädagogen der Hegelschen Schule: A. Kapp, K. Rosenkranz, und G. Thaulow. *Ibid.*, nos. 3-4.

Rudolf Murtfeld. Vergeblicher Kampf gegen den Idealismus: F. E. Benekes Schicksal und seine Wissenschaftstheorien. *Ibid.*, nos. 1-2.

Friedrich Metz. Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl und die Erforschung der deutschen Grenzlande. *Deutsches Archiv f. Landes- und Volksf.*, I, no. 1.

H. Guignard. H. Steffens et la littérature allemande. *Rev. German.*, XXVII, no. 4.

Ernst Laslowski. Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte Onno Klopps. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVI, no. 4.

Fritz Hartung. Preussen und die deutsche Einheit. *Forsch. Brandenburg. und Preuss. Gesch.*, XLIX, no. 1.

Adolf Hasenclever. Zur Geschichte der Venezuela-Blockade, 1902 und 1903. *Hist. Vierteljahrs.*, XXXI, no. 1.

Richard Samuel. Heinrich Lersch and the German Workers' Party. *Mod. Lang.*, June.

Theodor Schieder. Krieg und Nachkrieg in der politischen Geschichte des Nordostens: Eine Literaturumschau. *Altpreuss. Forsch.*, XIV, no. 1.

G. Eichstädt. Reinhold Seeberg als Prediger. *Archiv. f. Kirchengesch.*, CLVI, no. 1.

Assen Smedovski. La Roumanie et la Triple Alliance. *Rev. Hist. Dipl.*, Jan.

Marie Philippi Jasny. Some Aspects of German Agricultural Settlement. *Pol. Sci. Quar.*, June.

Documents

Walter Consuelo Langsam. An Austrian Plan for the Use of a Steam Engine on Danubian Boats, 1778-79. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Sept.

ITALY

Gaudens Megaro

The Historical Scholarship of Saint Bellarmine. By E. A. RYAN. (New York, Fordham University, 1936, pp. xiv, 226, $2.50.) Bellarmine, like Baronius, undertook to refute the Protestant view of church history and in so doing drew on a wide range of reading, orthodox and heretical, from the early days of Christianity to his own times. His sources are here identified and his use of them evaluated. One is disappointed to discover that in controversy he did not feel called upon to expose the spuriousness of the False Decretals, of which he was well aware. Father Ryan has done well in the execution of the task as he has conceived it. He would have been better able to come to grips with some problems had he known Erich Seeberg's *Gottfried Arnold* (1923). Arnold's *Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie* (1715) reversed the scale of values by discovering the true line of Christian succession among the heretics, much as Sebastian Franck had done in the sixteenth century. Seeberg's study is a review of Protestant historiography. He points out that all Protestants conceived of church history in terms of a fall, though differing as to the character and the time of the lapse. Luther saw the decline in the rise of the temporal power of the papacy, which he set in the pontificate of Boniface III (A.D. 607). One group of left wing Protestants objected to the union of church and state and set the fall, therefore, under Constantine. Another group found the corruption in the growing precision of dogma and placed the debacle immediately after the days of the Apostles. Erasmus, on the Catholic side, likewise lamented the formulation of exact creeds and their enforcement by the state. On the other hand, he interpreted the course of history not so much as a decline on the part of the church as an accommodation to the increasing depravity of mankind. Bellarmine apparently would admit no fall but saw, rather, a constant conflict between the church as the custodian of truth and Satan as the fomenter of heresy. One would like to know whether Bellarmine sensed the significance of these Protestant theories and whether he met them head on. ROLAND H. BAINTON.

L'Italie déçue. By GIORGIO QUARTARA. (Paris, Alcan, 1936, pp. 287, 18 fr.) This polemical book describes the manner in which Italy was deceived during and after the World War by her imperialist allies, particularly England and France. These allies, with the connivance of Wilson and House, betrayed Italian aspirations in the Adriatic, in Asia Minor, and in Africa. Quartara quotes freely from the writings of English, French, and American statesmen in order to emphasize their anti-Italian policies. The book advances many legitimate grievances, which must be taken into account if one is to understand Italy's turbulent postwar history, but it is disfigured by its emotional tone. The representatives of the Allies are denounced in virulent fashion, while the representatives of Italy, notably King Victor Emmanuel, are given undue praise. For example, England is "perfidious Albion" (pp. 123, 125); Wilson "était miné par la syphilis" (p. 175); and King Victor is presented as a noble figure. The author seems to be unaware of the ineptitude of such men as Sonnino, and he ignores the anti-imperialist and Mazzinian currents in Italian politics. He concludes his work with a plea for a United States of Europe.

ARTICLES

H. NICAISE. Notes sur les faïenciers italiens établis à Anvers dans le premier tiers du XVI^e^ siècle. *Rev. Belge,* Jan.

ANTONIO ROTA. Michelangelo e il Monte della Fede: Documenti inediti. *Archivi*, 1937, no. 1.

B. CROCE. Personaggi della storia italo-spagnuola: Il duca di Nocera, Francesco Carafa, e Baltasar Gracian. *Critica*, May.

EUGENIO ANAGNINE. L'Italia vista da' viaggiatori francesi del secolo XVII. *N. Riv. Stor.*, Jan.

PIA ONNIS. Filippo Buonarroti e i patrioti italiani dal 1794 al 1796. *Riv. Stor. Ital.*, June.

CARLO ZAGHI. Bonaparte e la repubblica cispadana. *Riv. Stor. Ital.*, Mar.

FABIO LUZZATTO. Vincenzo Dandolo, Giuseppe Compagnoni e "Les Hommes Nouveaux". *N. Riv. Stor.*, Jan.

ARTURO CODIGNOLA. La monarchia di Savoia e l'Inghilterra nell' ultimo periodo del predominio napoleonico. *Rass. Stor. Risorgimento*, Dec.

DARIO BIANDRÀ TRECCHI. Milano e gli Inglesi nel 1814: La missione del barone Trecchi. *Ibid.*, Apr.

LEOPOLDO MARCHETTI. L'indice del "Conciliatore". *Ibid.*

PIETRO NAPOLEONE BONAPARTE E GREGORIO XVI, con documenti inediti. *Civiltà Cattolica*, May 15, June 5.

GIULIO DEL BONO. Italia ed Ungheria nel 1848-1849. *Rass. Stor. Risorgimento*, Mar.

TANCREDI GALIMBERTI. Il processo del generale Ramorino. *Ibid.*, Feb.

NELLO ROSSELLI. Ancora di Montanelli e Cernuschi. *N. Riv. Stor.*, Jan.

LUIGI FEDERZONI. Dal regno all'impero. *N. Antol.*, May 1.

PAOLO DALLA TORRE. Contributo bibliografico ad una storia dello stato pontificio nell' anno 1867. *Rass. Stor. Risorgimento*, Dec.

EUGENIO PASSAMONTI. Dall' eccidio di Beilul alla questione di Raheita: Pagine di storia del primo colonialismo italiano [cont.]. *Ibid.*, Mar.

OTTO VOSSLER. Die italienische Expansion, 1881-1935. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, 1937, no. 2.

GIACOMO MARGOTTI, "il principe dei giornalisti cattolici italiani", dopo cinquant' anni dalla sua morte. *Civiltà Cattolica*, July 3.

FRANCESCO GERACI. La politica coloniale di Francesco Crispi. *Vita Ital.*, July.

PIETRO AGO. Il generale Pollio e le sue opere di storia militare. *N. Antol.*, June 16.

CARLO SFORZA. The Vatican and the World War. *Contemp. Rev.*, June.

LEO WOLLEMBORG. L'Italia, gli alleati e la politica di guerra nell' Oriente Prossimo, 1915-1917 [concl.]. *Rass. Stor. Risorgimento*, Dec.

FRANCESCO A. RÈPACI. Il bilancio dello stato italiano dalla unificazione ad oggi, 1862-1934/1935. *Riv. Stor. Ec.*, June.

EMILIO DE BONO. Planning the Ethiopian Conquest. *Harpers*, Aug.

PIERO DE'STEFANI. Considerazioni sul costo della guerra italo-etiopica [cont.]. *R.v. Ital. Sci. Ec.*, Apr.

MAJOR E. W. POLSON NEWMAN. Italian East Africa [concl.]. *Nineteenth Cent.*, Aug.

CORRADO ZOLI. The Organization of Italy's East African Empire. *For. Affairs*, Oct.

CARL T. SCHMIDT. Land Reclamation in Fascist Italy. *Pol. Sci. Quar.*, Sept.

DOCUMENTS

RAFFAELE CIAMPINI. Niccolò Tommaseo: Diario fiorentino, 1833. *N. Antol.*, June 16.

VICTOR POSTEL. A Rome sous Pie IX [cont.]. *Correspondant*, Apr. 11.

ALESSANDRO GUICCIOLI. Diario del 1883 [cont.]. *N. Antol.*, Aug. 16.

LUIGI ALDROVANDI. Le ultime sedute dei "Quattro": Frammenti di diario, 3-28 giugno 1919 [cont.]. *Ibid.*, May 1.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND YUGOSLAVIA

Hans Kohn

Staré letopisy české. Edited by FRANTIŠEK ŠIMEK. Introduction by F. M. Bartoš. (Prague, Historický Spolek, 1937, pp. xvii, 179.) This volume, the first in a series of source editions under the editorship of Professor Otakar Odložilik, reproduces in modern Czech orthography the famous chronicles of the Hussite times, the first editions of which, by Dobrovský (1784) and by Palacký (1829),

started modern Czech historiography. The older text editions have not been available for a long time, and this new edition, which is based upon the manuscript of the municipal library in Breslau, will be, therefore, most welcome.

Válečné dějiny československé. By FRANTIŠEK KURFÜRST. (Prague, Šolc a Šimáček, 1937, pp. 364.) This is the first systematic attempt at a military history of Czechoslovakia, of her battles and her military organization, from the earliest period to the present day. The author writes in an interesting way. The book is based on a very good knowledge of the sources but is devoid of scholarly apparatus.

Vladislav Varnenčik: Skutečnost i legenda. By RUDOLF URBÁNEK. (Prague, Czechoslovak Institute for Military Science, 1937, pp. 224.) This book deals with the short life and the end of King Vladislav III of the Jagellon dynasty, who was defeated by the Turks in the battle at Varna in 1444. The author discusses primarily the participation and strategy of Czech troops in the battle. The book contains a résumé in French.

Ročenka společnosti pro dějiny židů v Č S R. Volume VIII. Edited by S. STEINHERZ. (Prague, Taussig, 1937, pp. 379.) The eighth yearbook of the Jewish Historical Society of Czechoslovakia contains, like its predecessor, much valuable material. Some of the contributions are written in German, others in Czech. Among the first the most important is "Die jüdischen zünfte in Prag" by T. Jakobovits, a history of the development of Jewish trades and artisan guilds and of their relations with the Christian guilds from the Middle Ages to the year 1748. Another article, by R. Kestenberg, deals with "Hussitentum und Judentum".

Die Tschechoslovakische Republik: Ihre Staatsidee in der Vergangenheit und Gegenwart. Two volumes. Edited by J. MALYPETR, F. SOUKUP, J. KAPRAS. (Prague, Veritas, 1937, pp. 216; 344.) Of these two volumes the first, "Der Schritt der Geschichte", deals with the history of Czechoslovakia by a large number of authors, the second with the present problems of the country. The book, a semi-official publication, is very richly illustrated and contains many interesting reproductions of documents and sources of Czech history. Dr. Beneš writes on the political philosophy of Masaryk, Dr. Krofta on the Germans and on the religious problem in Czechoslovak history.

Zborov, 1917-1937. Edited by J. KOPTA, F. LANGER, R. MEDEK. (Prague, Čin, 1937, pp. 148.) The battle of Zborov on July 2, 1917, is one of the most memorable events in the story of the Czechoslovak legions in Russia. On its twentieth anniversary its historical, strategical, and national importance is reviewed in this semi-official publication.

The Foreign Policy of Czechoslovakia, 1918-1935. By FELIX JOHN VONDRACEK. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, Columbia University.] (New York, Columbia University, 1937, pp. 451, $5.00.) This is a useful chronological narrative, well documented and well arranged, although somewhat conventional. The author's viewpoint is in full harmony and sympathy with the official policy of Czechoslovakia as represented by her democratic leaders. This makes the book, which is written in an objective way, even more valuable, as there exist very few good presentations of the Czech point of view in English. It is, however, to be regretted that the Czech habit of giving the names of purely German towns within Czechoslovakia in Czech is followed by the author. Otherwise the treatment is thoroughly scholarly and avoids all attempt at propaganda.

Poslednich deset let československé práce dějepisné. By Josef Šusta. (Prague, Historický Klub, 1937, pp. 228.) This is an excellent and exhaustive survey of the whole field of Czechoslovak historiography and historical scholarship for the decade of 1925-35. It corresponds to the comprehensive bulletins which Professor Šusta publishes in the *Revue historique.*

Hrvatsko državno pravo u davnini. By A. St. Dabinović. (Zagreb, Mjesečnik, 1937, pp. 41.) The author analyzes the famous pact which the Hungarian King Koloman II concluded in 1102 with the Croats, and which formed the basis of the relations between Hungary and Croatia until 1918. He arrives at the conclusion that the pact only confirmed liberties and privileges which the Croatian nobles and the Dalmatian cities had enjoyed for four hundred years under the Byzantine emperors.

Articles

B. Mendl. Les derniers Přemyslides: La fin d'une dynastie slave. *Rev. Hist.,* Mar.
Wilhelm Wostry. Josef Pekař und sein Lebenswerk. *Slav. Rundschau,* 1937, no. 2.
Demetrius Caclamanos. Reminiscences of the Balkan Wars. *Slav. and East Europ. Rev.,* July.
Ivo Šarinić. Die Ideologie der kroatischen Bauernbewegung. *Slav. Rundschau,* 1937, no. 3.
R. W. Seton-Watson. Jugoslavia and the Croat Problem. *Slav. and East Europ. Rev.,* July.

Russia

Avrahm Yarmolinsky

The Travels of Macarius: Extracts from the Diary of the Travels of Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch, written in Arabic by his Son Paul, Archdeacon of Aleppo, in the Years of their Journeying, 1652-1660. Selected and arranged by Lady Laura Ridding. (New York, Oxford University, 1936, pp. xi, 125, $2.50.) Excerpts from *The Travels of Macarius,* translated from the Arabic by F. C. Balfour, were included by Lady Ridding's father, the Rev. William Palmer, in Volume II of his *The Patriarch and the Tsar* (London, 1873, pp. 1-387) as an eyewitness account of conditions in the Russian church under Alexei Mikhailovich, the father of Peter the Great. Lady Ridding's volume is an abridgement of these excerpts. Her epilogue (pp. 117-123) is not derived from *The Travels of Macarius,* which ends in 1661, but is based on other materials in her father's work. When Alexei Mikhailovich finally resolved to divest the ambitious and autocratic Patriarch Nikon of his dignities, Macarius, who had been patriarch of Antioch since 1647, was summoned to Moscow in 1663. With the patriarch of Alexandria, he took part in the synod which condemned and deposed Nikon and then participated in the *electum* of Joasaph, his successor. The period covered by the epilogue ends with Macarius's departure from Moscow during the summer of 1668. The passages in Paul's diary summarized or quoted by Lady Ridding are not without interest for students of the period, which was that of conflict between Kievan and Muscovite churchmen, of Nikon's reforms, and of Bogdan Khmelnitzki's submission to the czar. The splendor of the imperial court and the formality of ecclesiastical observances are contrasted with the barbarity of Muscovite criminal law and the squalor in which even the clergy lived. Hints of discontent with Nikon's arbitrary and cruel procedure were rife even during Macarius's first visit, and the presence of the Greek churchman dealt one more blow to Nikon's popularity with boyars and clergy. Unfortunately the text abounds in errors in the spelling of Russian place names, and even the glossary is not free from similar vagaries. Samuel H. Cross.

Kolonial'naya politika moskovskovo gosudarstva v Yakutii 17 v. [the colonial policy of Muscovy in Yakutia in the 17th century]. Edited by YA. P. AL'KOR and B. D. GREKOV. (Leningrad, Institut narodov Severa, 1936, pp. 281.)

Kolonial'naya politika tzarizma na Kamchatke i Chukotke v 18 veke [czarist colonial policy in Kamchatka and Chukotski Peninsula]. Edited by YA. P. AL'KOR and A. K. DRESEN. (*Ibid.*, 1935, pp. 277.) These are Volumes I and II of the Historical Publications of the Smidovich Institute of the Peoples of the North. The first volume is made up of transcripts of official records from the archives of the Historico-archaeographical Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad. Until 1840 these records were kept at Yakutsk. The documents published in the second volume come from the Leningrad Division of the Central Historical Archives and include material drawn from the records of Captain Bering's second Kamchatka expedition. Both volumes are an important contribution to the history and ethnography of the natives of northeastern Siberia. They are provided with ample indexes.

Gorodskiye vosstaniya v Moskovskom gosudarstve XVII v. [city uprisings in Muscovy, 17th century]. Edited by K. V. BAZILEVICH. (Moscow, Gos. sotz.-ekon. izdatel'stvo, 1936, pp. 182.) This contains native and foreign documents, some of them unpublished, relating to the bloody riots which broke out in 1648 in Moscow as well as in the provincial towns of Kozlov, Kursk, and Ustyug Veliky. The editor's introduction analyzes the economic and social conditions which led to the disturbances. There is a glossary of antiquated terms.

Tzarskaya votchina XVII v.: Iz istorii khozyaistvennoi i prikaznoi politiki tzarya Alekseya Mikhailovicha [the economic and administrative policy of Czar Alexis Mikhailovich]. By A. I. ZAOZERSKY. (Moscow, Gos. sotz.-ekon. izdatel'stvo, 1937, pp. 306.) This revised edition of a work first issued in 1917 under a different title is based on the records of *Tainyi prikaz*, the private chancery of Czar Alexis, which administered his private domain and had various other functions. It is a contribution to the knowledge of the central administrative machinery of Muscovy as well as of its economic life.

Reformy Petra I: Sbornik dokumentov [the reforms of Peter I]. Edited by V. I. LEBEDEV. (Moscow, Gos. sotz.-ekon. izdatel'stvo, 1937, pp. 379.) A collection of excerpts from the primary sources for the history of the reign of Peter the Great. The material used includes official records and diplomatic communications, memoirs by contemporaries, both natives and foreigners, and contemporary journalistic writings.

Politika tzarizma v Pribaltike v pervoi polovine XVIII g. [the policy of czarism in the Baltic provinces in the first half of the 18th century]. By YA. YA. ZUTIS. (Moscow, Gos. sotz.-ekon. izdatel'stvo, 1937, pp. 215.) The topics treated are: the historical premises of the union between the Baltic barons and the Russian government; commercial and military policy of the central government; roads in the Baltic provinces; land taxation in Livonia; taxation in Esthonia; social stratification of the Baltic gentry; the legalization of serfdom. There is an ample bibliography.

Velikaya knyaginya Yekaterina Pavlovna v Bogemii v 1813 g. [Grand Duchess Yekaterina Pavlovna in Bohemia in 1813]. By N. A. YELENEV. (Prague, 1936.) This is an account of diplomatic intrigue conducted by the sister of Alexander I against Napoleon in 1813.

Kolonialnaya politika rossiiskovo tzarizma v Azerbaidzhane v 20-60-kh gg. 19 v. [the colonial policy of Russian czarism in Azerbaijan in the 19th century].

Vol. I, pt. 1. (Moscow, Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1936, pp. 463.) This work is a collection of official documents drawn from Moscow and Leningrad archives and relating to the Russian administration of the Azerbaijan area in the Caucasus. The present volume covers the years 1827 to 1843. There is an introductory essay by I. P. Petrushevsky. Three more volumes are promised.

Tsushima. By A. Novikoff-Priboy. Translated by Eden and Cedar Paul. (New York, Knopf, 1937, pp. xxi, 425, $3.50.) This is a brilliantly written, for the most part firsthand, account of the Russian Baltic fleet's cruise to Japanese waters in 1904-05 and its annihilation at the Battle of Tsushima. As virtually all of the other Russian naval memoirs of the Russo-Japanese War which have been translated into Western European languages have come from officers, this vivid narrative by a paymaster's steward on the battleship *Oryol* is an important contribution. The book would be of less literary merit but of more importance had Novikoff-Priboy been a typical bluejacket. He was an intellectual revolutionist who, undaunted by a term as a political prisoner, sought to bore from within the imperial navy and measured all that he observed by its bearing upon the incipient class struggle. The hopeless voyage and its inevitably disastrous ending constituted a serious enough indictment of the old regime, but the author, not content with the grim actualities, colors his tale to exaggerate the decadent condition of the organization in which he served. The disparaging generalities are weakened, however, by the descriptions of the many splendid individual officers and of the many demonstrations of unsurpassable heroism throughout the fleet. In his discussions of the strategy and tactics of the high command the author shows plainly that he is venturing beyond his depth. Despite its limitations as a work of history, this book should not be overlooked by students of the Russo-Japanese War or by anyone interested in a remarkably realistic portrayal of the various Russian warships in action during one of the only two great naval battles of the steam and steel era. Edwin A. Falk.

Krakh germanskoi okkupatzii na Ukraine: Zusammenbruch der deutschen Okkupation in der Ukraine. Edited by I. Mintz and R. Eidemann. [Istoriya grazhdanskoi voiny v dokumentakh]. (Moscow, 1936, pp. 208.) This consists of Russian translations of German documents, most of them official communications, relating to the occupation of the Ukraine by Austro-German forces in 1918. The originals are kept in the Central Archives of the October Revolution in Moscow and in the Central Archives of the Revolution, Kharkov.

Articles

Anatole G. Mazour. Modern Russian Historiography. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, June.

E. Zvyagintzev. Chuma v Moskue v XVII i XVIII vv. [the bubonic plague in Moscow, 17th-18th centuries]. *Istoricheski zhurnal*, 1937, no. 2.

A. Presnov. Tzarskaya Rossiya i frantzuzskaya burzhuaznaya revolyutziya 1789 g. [Russia and the French Revolution]. *Ibid.*

P. Sofinov. A. S. Pushkin—issledovatel' Pugachevskovo dvizheniya [Pushkin as a student of the Pugachev movement]. *Ibid.*

Reinhard H. Luthin. The sale of Alaska. *Slav. Rev.*, July.

V. F. Yegoryev. Vladivostokski otryad kreĭserov v russko-yaponskuyu voĭnu [the Vladivostok naval squadron in the Russo-Japanese War]. *Morskoĭ sbornik*, 1937, no. 3.

V. Petrovski. Zimniye operatzii v mirovuyu voĭnu na Baltiĭskom teatre [winter operations on the Baltic Sea during the World War]. *Ibid.*

A. Y. Shishkin. Operatzii podvodnykh lodok na Baltiĭskom more v grazhdanskuyu voĭnu [submarine operations in the Baltic Sea, 1918-19]. *Ibid.*, 1936, no. 12.

AVRAHM YARMOLINSKY, ed. Pushkin in English: A List of Works by and about Pushkin, compiled by the Slavonic Division. *Bull New York Public Library*, July (also separate).

DOCUMENTS

Prodovol'stvennoye polozheniye v Moskve v marte-iyune 1917 goda [provisioning of Moscow in March-June, 1917]. *Krasnyĭ arkhiv*, 1937, no. 2.

NORTHERN EUROPE

L. M. Larson

Der handelsgeschichtliche Wert der Sundzollregister: Ein Beitrag zu seiner Beurteilung. By AKSEL E. CHRISTENSEN. (Copenhagen, pp. 28-142.) Some forty years ago the Danish historian Nina Bang was making a study of the Sound dues and came to the conclusion that they contained valuable historical information which should be made more readily accessible. Finding that the financial resources at her disposal were not sufficient for the publication of the materials *in extenso,* she proceeded to summarize the records in the form of statistical tables, of which four volumes have been published (Copenhagen, 1906-30). Historians have not all been agreed that the records are worth publishing, some holding that they are neither reliable nor complete. To end this disagreement Aksel E. Christensen undertook to make an extended examination of the available materials and to test them with the use of certain related sources. His final conclusion and report are that while Nina Bang's tables were not the best form that could be devised, they have made accessible, at least in great part, an important and wholly reliable source for the study of the history of European commerce.

Statsomvæltningen i 1660. By C. O. BÖGGILD ANDERSEN. (Copenhagen, Levin & Munksgaard, 1936, pp. 454, 10 kr.) In the revolution of 1660 the Danish monarchy shed its elective character and became hereditary; at the same time it became practically absolute. The question of how this was achieved has never found a convincing reply. Much depends on what attitude one takes toward Nils Slange's account of the event, which was, however, not published till sixty years later. Böggild Andersen is highly critical of Slange's history; he believes that it is in part a fabrication, though he does not wholly reject it. In other respects, too, his views differ from those generally accepted. He emphasizes the active influence of Hannibal Sehested, a highly talented statesman who was just then returning to favor after having spent nearly a decade in self-imposed exile. The author has corrected the traditional account on many points, but until the question of the credibility of Slange's narrative has been satisfactorily dealt with, his conclusions will scarcely receive more than a tentative acceptance.

Försvaret av Östersjöprovinserna, 1708-1710. I-II[1]. By FREDRIK ARFWIDSSON. (Gävle, Hallberg, 1936, pp. xxii, 422, 10 kr.) Dr. Arfwidsson's subject is the advance and operations of the Russian armies in the Baltic provinces, particularly after the Swedish defeat at Poltava. There has long been a belief that the Swedish council of state was niggardly in its support of the garrisons in the Baltic strongholds, but the author, though critical toward the administration, seems to believe that the problem facing the regents was one of national finance rather than of military force. The Swedish exchequer had no substantial credit abroad, and without funds the council found it difficult to provide supplies. The study closes with the fall of Riga in 1710.

Elleveårskrigens militære historie. Volume I. By J. SCHIÖTZ. (Oslo, Forsvarsdepartmentet, 1936, pp. xix, 500, 12 kr.) Some years ago the Norwegian government, wishing to promote systematic research in military history, voted a subsidy for this purpose to be expended under the direction of the general staff. The first project to be chosen was a history of the Great Northern War (now called "the Eleven Years' War"), the study to begin with the declaration issued from Copenhagen in 1709. After extended research in the archives of all the Northern countries Col. Schiötz has been able to produce an account which is more complete than any earlier history of the war and serves to correct conventional views on many points.

Sverige och Europa, 1716-1718. By S. JÄGERSKIÖLD. (Uppsala, 1937, pp. xxiii, 489, 10 kr.) In the closing years of the reign of Charles XII Swedish policy, both foreign and domestic, was directed by Georg Heinrich von Görtz, an adventurer from Holstein, who has been described as "a man of desperate expedients". How desperate these actually were is clearly brought out in Jägerskiöld's study, in which the diplomacy of Sweden and her many enemies is told in all its crafty, though more often fatuous, details.

Skandinavismens Kulmination: Ministeriet Halls Planer om en Nordisk Union forud for Udstedelsen af Martskundgörelsen, 1863. By AAGE FRIIS. (Copenhagen, Levin and Munksgaard, 1936, pp. 60, 3.50 kr.) On March 30, 1863, the Danish prime minister, Carl Christian Hall, announced the policy of his government to sever the age-long connection between Schleswig and Holstein and to incorporate the northern duchy into the Danish kingdom. Just what motivated this proclamation has always been something of a mystery, though conjectures have not been wanting. Professor Friis has published what seems to be an adequate explanation, drawn from recently published materials of the memoir type. His conclusion seems to be that in March of that year Hall believed in the possibility of an early union of the Scandinavian states. Two prominent members of the Danish ministry had approached the Swedish envoy, Henning Hamilton, with the proposition that Charles XV should permit the Danes to choose him as heir and successor to the reigning king. Carl Ploug, who led the Scandinavian movement in Denmark, managed to have the same suggestion brought directly before the Swedish monarch. Knowing that an influential element in Sweden was hostile to the idea of a union with Denmark, King Charles did not dare to encourage his Danish friends but proposed a defensive alliance instead of political union. When Frederick VII died (in November) King Charles had been forced to retreat even from this position, and Prince Christian, who was German and decidedly unpopular, mounted the throne as Christian IX. For the suggestion that the government was maturing plans to prevent Christian's accession by revolutionary methods Professor Friis finds no supporting evidence.

ARTICLES

RUDOLF BERGSTRÖM. Det svenska krigståget mot Skåne vinteren 1523. *Hist. Tidskr.* (Swed.), 1937, no. 2.

LAURITZ WEIBULL. Vesterås riksdag 1527. *Scandia,* May.

D. DOROSCHENKO. Svensk-ukrainska förbindelser under 1600- och 1700-talen. *Hist. Tidskr.* (Swed.), 1937, no. 2.

SVEN NILSSON. 1634 års regeringsform. *Scandia,* May.

ALBERT OLSEN. Kobberpolitik i den svenske Stormagtstid. *Ibid.*

TH. A. MÜLLER. Holbergs to ældste historiske Arbeider. *Hist. Tidsskr.* (Dan.), 1936, no. 2, 1937, no. 1.

OSCAR J. FALNES. New England Interest in Scandinavian Culture and the Norsemen. *New Eng. Quar.,* June.

FAR EASTERN HISTORY

C. H. Peake

Report of the Librarian of Congress for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1936. (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1936, pp. vi, 362.) The account of the recent accessions to the Division of Orientalia of the Library of Congress on pages 168 to 204 of this report was submitted by the chief of that division, Dr. Arthur W. Hummel, with the assistance of Dr. Walter T. Swingle and Dr. Shio Sakanishi. It is as full of interesting and valuable items of bibliographical and historical information as previous similar reports. Much research has gone into the compiling of these reports, and those interested in Far Eastern studies will find them useful. It is to be hoped that the time will soon come when it will be possible to include Chinese characters in these reports, for it is frequently difficult to ascertain just which characters the romanized forms represent.

An Annotated Bibliography of Selected Chinese Reference Works. Compiled by Ssu-yü Têng and Knight Biggerstaff. (Peiping, Harvard-Yenching Institute; Cambridge, Harvard University, 1936, pp. vi, 271, $1.50.) For anyone unfamiliar with Chinese studies it is hard to realize how great the difficulties are for a Western student in finding his way through the vast collections of Chinese books. Chinese scholars have been very prolific in the compilation of compendiums of various kinds, which frequently contain information no longer available at first hand. These are of unequal value, and each has its specific usefulness. It is of great benefit to the student to have some reliable guide through this maze of works which the industry of centuries has built up. Starting with a similar work in Chinese published in 1935 by Mr. Têng Ssu-yü alone, the authors jointly have undertaken to provide just such a guide in the English language. I have already found abundant evidence of its great usefulness. Exact and methodical information is given on some hundreds of reference works. The bibliography is almost entirely limited to Chinese publications. It includes only a few Japanese works. In a later edition the Western student would like the latter to be treated more exhaustively, especially in the field of Buddhism, where so much excellent work has been done by Japanese scholars. Likewise it would be a good thing if in an introductory chapter the principal handbooks, reference works, and bibliographical studies by Western scholars should be included, so that the student would find, in one volume, all the books, Western and Chinese alike, that can render him the greatest service in his studies. This is in no sense a reproach to the authors; with the resources they had at their disposal they have done a good piece of work. J. J. L. Duyvendak.

La Chine, passé et présent. By Jean Escarra. (Paris, Colin, 1937, pp. 213, 13 fr.) Professor Escarra, who for many years has been legal adviser to various Chinese governments and is one of the leading Western authorities on Chinese law, has presented in this small volume a well-written historical account of Chinese society. The emphasis is on the contemporary reconstruction of China along political, social, and legal lines.

The Development of China. By Kenneth Scott Latourette. (New York, Houghton Mifflin, 1937, pp. xi, 333, $3.00.) Professor Latourette's well-known introduction to the history of China has now reached its fifth edition in the twenty years that have elapsed since it first appeared. In order to bring it up to date the latter part of the sixth chapter and the entire seventh chapter have been rewritten.

The Abrogation of the Gentlemen's Agreement: Being the Harvard Phi Beta Kappa Prize Essay for 1936. By RODMAN W. PAUL. (Cambridge, Harvard University, 1936, pp. xiii, 117, $1.25.) Mr. Paul has carefully traced the passage through Congress of the Immigration Act of 1924 as it bore on the question of Japanese immigration. That act brought to an end the Gentlemen's Agreement negotiated by Theodore Roosevelt in 1907-08, which had settled the question of regulation of Japanese immigration without injury to Japanese pride. This, however, had been achieved through the surrender to Japan of one of the supreme attributes of sovereignty, the real decision as to whether or not each would-be Japanese immigrant was eligible for admission having been left to the Japanese government to decide. This aspect of the agreement, together with its failure to prevent the entrance of "picture-brides", which had resulted in the rapid increase in the number of Japanese in this country, led Congress to abrogate the agreement in 1924. A useful bibliography is appended.

The Shanghai Problem. By WILLIAM CRANE JOHNSTONE. (Stanford, University Press, 1937, pp. xi, 326, $3.00.) This is a brief and scholarly account, perhaps too oversimplified, of the development of the three cities at Shanghai, which make up the largest urban area and the greatest seaport in China. The problems discussed deal with industry and labor, settlement extension and extra-settlement roads, representation in the foreign municipal councils, neutrality, rendition, and the future of Shanghai. In the discussion the legalistic features are stressed, whereas Shanghai, like Topsy, just growed up. Its development can best be understood when conditions prevailing contemporaneously in the hinterland are understood. If the several topics are not treated in great detail, the bibliography and citations will indicate where fuller information may be obtained, but only the specialist will need to go further than Dr. Johnstone takes him. The chapter which will doubtless be read with greatest interest is, unfortunately, the least authoritative. The very title indicates the doubtful sources of the materials. To speak of what happened in Shanghai on the night of January 28, 1932, as "The Japanese Invasion" smacks of journalism and not objective research. Dr. Johnstone recognizes this in his warning that the official reports and statements which he used "are just as important for what they omit as for what they include". And among his authorities he cites "statements" made to him in Shanghai in 1934. As Shanghai is one of the most rumor-ridden cities in the world, such "statements" should be subjected to thorough investigation. It may be said, however, that a little more research and less credulity would have prevented some of the fundamental misstatements. A careful study of the official map which he prints would have checked some of the rumors he later heard. And if he had compared the Defense Plan of 1927 with that of 1931, he would have modified some of his conclusions. PAYSON J. TREAT.

ARTICLES

HANS KOHN. The Europeanization of the Orient. *Pol. Sci. Quar.*, June.

W. CARL RUFUS. Astronomy in Korea. *Trans. Korea Branch Roy. Asiatic Soc.*, 1936.

C. HAGUENAUER. À propos de nouvelles recherches concernant le Leao-tong, la Corée et le Japon (Shikoku) antiques. *Jour. Asiatique*, July, 1936.

H. H. DUBS. The Attitude of Han Kao-tzu to Confucianism. *Jour. Am. Oriental Soc.*, June.

CHANG, YIN-LING. Nan-Sung Wang Kuo Shih Pu [military and financial administration at the end of the Southern Sung dynasty]. *Yenching Hsüeh-pao*, Dec.

TÊNG, SSU-YÜ. Ming Ta-kao yü Ming-ch'u chih Cheng-ch'ih She-hui [social and political conditions at the beginning of the Ming dynasty as reflected in the Ming Ta-kao]. *Ibid.*

YU TENG. Ming-tai Chien-Ch'a Chih-tu Kai-shu [the censorate under the Ming dynasty]. *Chin-ling Hsüeh-pao*, Nov., 1936.

T. C. Lin. Manchurian Trade and Tribute in the Ming Dynasty: A Study of Chinese Theories and Methods of Control over Border Peoples. *Nankai Soc. and Ec. Quar.*, Dec.

Chang, Wei-hua. Ming-chi Hsi-pan-ya tsai Lü-sung yü Chung-kuo chih Kuan-hsi [Sino-Spanish relations in the Philippines during the latter part of the Ming dynasty]. *Yü-Kung*, Jan.

L. Carrington Goodrich. Cinchona in China. *China Jour.*, July.

Kenneth Ch'en. Yuan Shih K'ai and the Coup d'État of 1898 in China. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, June.

Robert Karl Reischauer. Alien Land Tenure in Japan. *Trans. Asiatic Soc. Japan*, 1936.

Cyrus H. Peake. Sun Yat-senism in Translation and Commentary. *Amerasia*, July.

Laurence K. Rosinger. The Far East as reflected in the German Press. *Ibid.*, Aug.

John E. Orchard. Oriental Competition in World Trade. *For. Affairs*, July.

UNITED STATES HISTORY

E. C. Burnett

General

Official Publications relating to American State Constitutional Conventions. The University of Chicago Libraries, Document Section. (New York, H. W. Wilson, 1936, pp. 91, $1.25, planographed.) Such official publications as journals, proceedings, minutes, debates, reports, documents, reports of majority and minority committees, and proposed and rejected constitutions as a whole are included in this bibliography. Adopted constitutions, which are ordinarily easily accessible in the codes and revised statutes, are omitted, as are also publications dealing with amendments to the constitutions on special subjects. Copies of the titles listed are located in American libraries. Doris M. Reed.

American Opinion of Roman Catholicism in the Eighteenth Century. By Sister Mary Augustina (Ray). [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law.] (New York, Columbia University Press, 1936, pp. 456, $4.75.) This scholarly study of anti-Catholic sentiment in America during the colonial period is divided into three parts: the English origins of the No Popery tradition; the perpetuation of the tradition in colonial religion, education, and literature; and the application of the tradition in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Revolutionary decade, and the drafting of the state constitutions. Only the French Alliance and Catholic aid to the patriot cause during the Revolution tempered the ancient hostility to Rome, which still remained sufficiently strong to invade all but four of the state constitutions. The author's major contribution is made in the three chapters on the anti-Catholic tradition in religion, education, and literature. Not satisfied with obvious sources, she has made an exhaustive study of political pamphlets, fast day proclamations, almanacs, broadsides, ballads, newspapers, magazines, plays, poems, sermons, and the works of colonial historians in an effort to record the opinion of the man on the street as well as that of the intellectual leaders and clergy. Unfortunately the semi-topical method employed is not effective in showing the ebb and flow of anti-Catholic feeling through the two centuries. One has only to thumb the index of such a source as the *Archives of Maryland* to realize the close correlation between colonial No Popery sentiment and wars with France and Spain. The fact that the author makes this mutual relation less clear to the reader than to herself is due to the method of presentation. Nor does the book explain the persistence of traditional prejudices in a land where European intolerance was mellowed by the frontier and by the clash of many sects. The study clearly shows that intolerance *did* exist, but more interpretation as to *why* it existed would have been helpful. The book contains

a lengthy bibliography and a conclusion in which the author expresses the hope that studies such as hers will lead to a better interdenominational understanding. Certainly the unbiased treatment, pleasing style, and gentle tolerance for intolerant materials that she has shown cannot help but contribute to that end.

RAY ALLEN BILLINGTON.

The American Magazine, or a Monthly View of the Political State of the British Colonies. [The Facsimile Text Society.] (New York, Columbia University Press, 1937, pp. 120, $2.00.) The earliest strictly American magazine appeared in Philadelphia in three issues of the winter and spring of 1741 from the printing house of Andrew Bradford, its first number anticipating the publication of Franklin's *General Magazine* by three days. Its timely and well-written content was chiefly political in character, and judging from the contributions on the general subject of the proprietary governments of Maryland and Pennsylvania, it was definitely on the liberal side. This republication in facsimile, for which we are grateful to the publishers, has been made from copies and parts of copies in the John Carter Brown Library, the New York Historical Society, and the Library of Congress. The concise and competent introduction is, most appropriately, by Lyon N. Richardson. LAWRENCE C. WROTH.

Naval Documents related to the Quasi-War between the United States and France: Naval Operations, 1798-1801. Prepared by the Office of Naval Records and Library, Navy Department, under the Supervision of Captain Dudley W. Knox. Volumes I-IV. (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1935; 1935; 1936; 1936, pp. xi, 654; vii, 624; vii, 657; vii, 676, $3.50 each.) This collection of documents will reach six or seven volumes. It is similar in scope to the *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion,* but the binding and paper are far superior, and, what is more important, there are excellent indexes. The material is arranged in strict chronological order, which spoils any pleasure in reading and makes it fatiguing to follow the history of any particular person or vessel. This, however, is a small matter compared to the advantage of having such valuable material in published form.

American Writers: A Series of Papers contributed to Blackwood's Magazine, 1824-1825. By JOHN NEAL. (Durham, Duke University Press, 1937, pp. viii, 261, $3.00.) The reprinting of John Neal's *tour de force* from Blackwood's, with critical introduction and notes by Fred Lewis Pattee, is a welcome addition to the study of a period of vigorous activity in American letters. Its editor succinctly summarizes the modern student's point of view regarding this "slapdash mess of misinformation and prejudice" by saying that its obvious faults do "not detract from its value as an historic document". Neal, indeed, is often informative and occasionally is brilliant in his critical judgments. The alphabetically arranged biographical and critical sketches of his book reveal a degree and variety of literary performance realized only by specialists in the period and subject. Without doubt the editor has already discovered his confusion of grandfather with grandson, in the note on page 84, which allows Cadwallader Colden (1688-1776) to write the *History of the Five Indian Nations* in 1727 and a life of Robert Fulton in 1817. LAWRENCE C. WROTH.

Early Eighteenth Century Palatine Emigration: A British Government Redemptioner Project to Manufacture Naval Stores. By WALTER ALLEN KNITTLE, with a Foreword by Dixon Ryan Fox. (Philadelphia, Dorrance, 1937, pp. xix, 320, $3.50.) This book deals exhaustively and skillfully with a well-known episode in eighteenth century history. To the student of nineteenth century immigration

it is especially interesting because, except for chronology, in its outlines and even details it might easily fit into a volume on the history of immigration in the nineteenth century. It is the familiar story of burdensome taxes, hard times, religious dissatisfaction, propaganda, governmental policy, terrible suffering on the transatlantic voyage, swindling "friends", disillusionment, and assimilation, enriched by illuminating chapters relating the story of a "forgotten attempt at public operation of an industry . . . before the days of prejudice against government operation of industry". It also shows the effect of the selective process of the frontier in the "Old West" on the unconventional, nonconforming, and sometimes unruly Palatines. Dr. Knittle's monograph is scholarly, well written, well poised, and told with a wealth of detail drawn from published and unpublished primary sources, official and unofficial, and secondary accounts. The author's visit to the area of the Palatine settlements in County Limerick, Ireland, in 1934, in order to confirm the testimony of documents, certainly brings the story down to date. A classified bibliography, twelve appendixes, and an index reveal the same excellence of workmanship as the text.

GEORGE M. STEPHENSON.

Pioneers of American Economic Thought in the Nineteenth Century. By ERNEST TEILHAC. (New York, Macmillan, 1936, pp. xi, 187, $2.50.) In this study the author attempts to analyze the economic thought of Henry Raymond, H. C. Carey, and Henry George by reference to the total stream of French and English economic thought in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries. His method gives a highly disjunctive effect, for he does not present systems of ideas to which the systems of thought developed by these men are referred. A piece of one man's ideas is compared to a piece of another's, their conclusions contrasted, the similarity of one conclusion with the ideas of a third party noted, and so on through a tangential process of association and comparison. Sometimes the connection is a comment by one of the men studied on the contention of an earlier writer. Elsewhere the author simply observes a similarity of one writer's ideas to those of another. Some useful information about the writings of Raymond, Carey, and George can be dug out of the pages of this book, but whatever merits this sort of cataloguing study may have for the student of "pure theory", it has little to offer of interest to the historian.

CAROLINE F. WARE.

Roosevelt to Roosevelt: The United States in the Twentieth Century. By DWIGHT LOWELL DUMOND. (New York, Henry Holt, 1936, pp. ix, 585, $3.50.) The present tendency is to write history almost as soon as it is made. Professor Dumond recognizes the danger of this practice but hopes that his story will be of use to students who wish to be informed about our recent past. This book tends toward the "unit" system now gaining popularity in the public schools. For example, chapter IV deals with presidential elections, 1904-1912, without much comment on related subjects, and chapter XIV does the same for 1920-1932. The first hundred pages are given over to the Roosevelt-Taft era. The chapter on the World War indicates that the author does not accept Senator Nye's view that we went in to "save the skins of the bankers", or that all the blame should be laid on the munition makers. "Post-War Reaction" starts with the prosecution of Debs and Berger and ends with the oaths imposed on teachers (1935). "The Age of the Golden Calf" is a medley of population, immigration, speculation, taxation, and expenditure down to 1935. The various activities of the New Deal are treated sympathetically but critically in three chapters. The chapter on "Social Security" is not prefaced, as it might have been, with an account of what had

been done by the states and by private industry with this end in view. A few statements are open to criticism. The author accepts "the fact that the *Lusitania* was armed" (p. 210), which has not yet been proved to be a fact. The Glass-Steagall Act allowed only limited branch banking (p. 430). The reports of the director of the A.A.A. say that the farmers were paid 28 cents a bushel in 1933 and 29 cents in 1934 for their quotas of wheat, not 42 cents (p. 458). On the whole the book is an excellent account of recent American history, and the "layman", as well as the student, may profit by reading it. DAVID Y. THOMAS.

Migration and Economic Opportunity: The Report of the Study of Population Redistribution. By CARTER GOODRICH *et al.* [Industrial Research Department of the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce.] (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1936, pp. xvii, 763, $5.00.) "Where should the people be? And how can they best get there?" In these simple words the authors state the object of this study. As the title implies, the volume is a clear recognition that migration, especially internal migration, is primarily motivated by the search for better economic opportunity. We have here an impressive factual examination of the problem as it appears in the United States. The following major conclusions are reached: (1) that the worst "problem areas" are suffering from chronic and not temporary poverty; (2) that a total of four million people must move from the four chief problem areas (the Southern Appalachian Coal Plateau, the Old Cotton Belt, the Cutover Region of the Lake states, and the Great Plains) in order to put the land to its most economic uses; (3) that migration must be induced by economic incentives; (4) that there is no evidence of industrial decentralization as a geographic palliative; (5) that increased industrial output will not bring proportionate increase in employment; (6) that permanent expansion of the service trades can come only with a rise in real income for the majority of people. With these conclusions, the authors cannot and do not escape the further inference that economic redistribution of our population depends on considerable modification of the existing system. They do not go so far as to advocate a collective economy as a solution, but this, I venture to guess, is timidity rather than blindness. The volume makes gloomy reading for him who would save us within the capitalistic framework. For the collectivist it is at once telling ammunition and a warning. The collective path would remove the barriers to solution, but tremendous technical problems cannot be solved automatically; intelligence and industry must remember that a collective society will not yield Utopia over night.

LOUISE PEARSON MITCHELL.

The People, Yes. By CARL SANDBURG. (New York, Harcourt, 1936, pp. 286, $2.50.) This volume of 107 chunks of very free verse should be constantly on the desk of any social scientist working with such big concepts as "the American nation", "American institutions", etc. Here is the *Geist* of our American culture, its traditions, and its present realities as lived daily in folk thought and sentiment. The book is salty, gritty with the soil of folk talk about all the big symbols by which men live. The reviewer has found himself going back and back to it in the months since its publication to refresh his sense of what this United States feels like to the people who carry its destiny within their skins.

ROBERT S. LYND.

ARTICLES

KATHARINE ELIZABETH CRANE. Teaching American Biography. *Soc. Educ.*, Sept.

OTTO HELLER. Charles Sealsfield: A Forgotten Discoverer of the Valley of the Mississippi. *Missouri Hist. Rev.*, July.

JEAN DELANGLEZ. La Salle, 1669-1673. *Mid-America,* July.

JOSEPH P. CARROLL, JR. God and Country. *Rec. Am. Cath. Hist. Soc.,* Mar.

G. H. S. KING. Washington's Boyhood Home. *William and Mary Coll. Quar. Hist. Mag.,* Apr.

ALLEN FRENCH. The British Expedition to Concord in 1775. *Jour. Am. Mil. Hist. Foundation,* Spring.

MERRILL JENSEN. The Articles of Confederation: A Re-Interpretation. *Pacific Hist. Rev.,* June.

WILLIAM R. WARD. The Makers of the Constitution. *Proc. New Jersey Hist. Soc.,* July.

FRANK H. GARVER. Leadership in the Constitutional Convention of 1787. *Sociology and Soc. Research,* July.

RANDOLPH C. DOWNES. Creek-American Relations, 1782-1790. *Georgia Hist. Quar.,* June.

H. A. DE WEERD. Was Lawrence a Great Soldier? *Infantry Jour., Cavalry Jour., Coast Artillery Jour.,* May.

MILTON S. DAVIS. The Capture of Washington [1814]. *U. S. Naval Inst. Proc.,* June.

DU BOSE MURPHY. Caleb S. Ives. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Epis. Church,* June.

L. G. VANDER VELDE. The Diary of George Duffield. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.,* June.

E. B. IAMS. Index to the Estates of the Upper Ohio Valley [cont.]. *New York Geneal. and Biog. Rec.,* July.

LEWIS E. ATHERTON. The Services of the Frontier Merchant. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.,* Sept.

LEO GREGORY FINK. Monsignor Heinen, Diocesan Missionary [1839-1910]. *Rec. Am. Cath. Hist. Soc.,* June.

CLARENCE E. MACARTNEY. The First National Republican Convention. *Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag.,* June.

MRS. LYON G. TYLER. The Slave Trade, Slavery, and Liberia. *Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag.,* July.

HARVEY WISH. American Slave Insurrections before 1861. *Jour. Negro Hist.,* July.

Lincoln—Trustee of the Town of Springfield. *Bull. Abraham Lincoln Assoc.,* June.

PAUL M. ANGLE. Lincoln and the United States Supreme Court. *Ibid.,* May, June.

EMANUEL HERTZ. Abraham Lincoln—the Jurist of the Civil War. *New York Univ. Law Quar. Rev.,* May.

LUCY L. TASHER. The *Missouri Democrat* and the Civil War. *Missouri Hist. Rev.,* July.

COURTNEY ROBERT HALL. The Influence of the Medical Department upon Confederate War Operations. *Jour. Am. Mil. Hist. Foundation,* Summer.

JOHN C. YENCHAR. Longstreet, General Lee's War-Horse. *Quartermaster Rev.,* May.

C. C. RITZE. In Defense of Mrs. Lincoln. *Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc.,* Apr.

EDWARD EVERETT DALE. The Cow Country in Transition. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.,* June.

ELIZABETH H. DAVISON. Early Development of Public Opinion against Southern Child Labor. *North Carolina Hist. Rev.,* July.

CHESTER MCA. DESTLER. The Origin and Character of the Pendleton Plan. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.,* Sept.

HORACE H. RUSSELL. The Finnish Farmers in America. *Agricultural Hist.,* Apr.

HAROLD H. DUNHAM. Some Crucial Years of the General Land Office, 1875-1890. *Ibid.*

JOHN T. GANOE. The Desert Land Act in Operation, 1877-1891. *Ibid.*

JEANNETTE P. NICHOLS. John Sherman and the Silver Drive of 1877-1878: The Origins of the Gigantic Subsidy. *Ohio State Arch. and Hist. Quar.,* Apr.

THOMAS A. BAILEY. Was the Presidential Election of 1900 a Mandate on Imperialism? *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.,* June.

Id. Theodore Roosevelt and the Alaska Boundary Settlement. *Can. Hist. Rev.,* June.

JOHN D. BLACK and R. H. ALLEN. The Growth of Farm Tenancy in the United States. *Quar. Jour. Ec.,* May.

H. A. GOSNELL. World War Losses of the United States Navy. *U. S. Naval Inst. Proc.,* July.

RALPH H. LUTZ. The World War in History: A Survey of Source Materials in the Hoover War Library. *Jour. Am. Mil. Hist. Foundation,* Spring.

ROBERT R. WILSON. International Law in Treaties of the United States. *Am. Jour. Internat. Law,* Apr.

HENRY W. EDGERTON. The Incidence of Judicial Control over Congress. *Cornell Law Quar.,* Apr.

JOHN H. HATCHER. Some Vital Principles of the American Constitutional Government. *West Virginia Law Quar.*, Apr.

LOUISE OVERACKER. Campaign Funds in the Presidential Election of 1936. *Am. Pol. Sci. Rev.*, June.

MERLE CURTI. Dime Novels and the American Tradition. *Yale Rev.*, Summer.

SAMUEL WILLISTON. William Richards: The South Sea Solomon. *New Eng. Quar.*, June.

MARY ELLEN MARTIN. History of the Kapiolani Home, Honolulu, T. H. *Rec. Am. Cath. Hist. Soc.*, Mar.

DOCUMENTS

ROBERTO RIDOLFI. Una lettera inedita di Amerigo Vespucci sopra il suo terzo viaggio. *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, 1937, no. 1.

Revolutionary Letters [Henry Laurens to Gen. Benjamin Lincoln, Apr. 19, 1780; Gen. Nathanael Greene to Gen. Robert Howe, Dec. 29, 1780; Gen. Isaac Huger to Col. Lewis Morris, May 22, 1781; Stephen Drayto to Gen. Greene, June 22, 1781; Henry Lee, jr., to Gen. Greene, Dec. 15, 1781]. *South Carolina Hist. and Geneal. Mag.*, July.

John Jacob Astor Correspondence: Fur Trade with Lower Canada, 1790-1817. *Moorsfield Antiquar.*, May, Aug.

A Frontier Committee of Safety during the War Scare of 1807. *Ibid.*, May.

Garrison Orders: Burlington, Vermont, July 13-Aug. 4, 1813. *Ibid.*, Aug.

ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT, ed. The Accident on Board the U. S. S. *Princeton*, February 28, 1844: A Contemporary News-Letter. *Pennsylvania Hist.*, July.

BARBARA BURR, ed. Letters from Two Wars [letters from and to Lindorf Ozburn during the Mexican War and the Civil War]. *Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc.*, Apr.

HAROLD S. BENDER, ed. A Letter of Hohn H. Oberholtzer to Friends in Germany, 1849. *Mennonite Quar. Rev.*, Apr.

The 1860 Presidential Campaign: Cassius M. Clay to Cephas Brainerd. *Moorsfield Antiquar.*, Aug.

Lincoln's Visit to Richmond, April 4, 1865: Charles Carlton Coffin to Thomas Nast. *Ibid.*, May.

An After Effect of the Civil War: Letter of William Isaac Chamberlain, September 27, 1880. *Ibid.*, Aug.

NEW ENGLAND AND MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The Puritan Pronaos: Studies in the Intellectual Life of New England in the Seventeenth Century. By SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON. (New York, New York University Press, 1936, pp. 281, $3.75.) This delightful series of lectures, delivered at the Washington Square center of New York University in November and December, 1934, will be welcomed by all students of American colonial history. Professor Morison gives us first the English and religious background of New England intellectual life and follows with lectures on higher education, the elementary schools, the public grammar schools, printing and bookselling, libraries, theology and the sermon, historical and political literature, verse, and finally scientific strivings. Written in the clear and vigorous style characteristic of the author and reflecting years of delving into New England colonial history, the book is an able supplement to Dr. Thomas Goddard Wright's *Literary Culture in Early New England*. Professor Morison thinks that in recent years historians have overstressed the religious aspect of education in colonial New England and have decried the school system "as a mere device to clamp the puritan creed on the country, devoid of real educational value". No doubt the pendulum has swung too far away from the fulsome praise formerly bestowed upon the New England educational system, and Professor Morison is right in asking a fresh and more sympathetic evaluation. In his desire to secure justice for New England, however, he is not always entirely fair to other colonies. In view of the purposes of the Quakers in coming to Pennsylvania, is it quite just

to say: "New England differed from the other English colonies in that it was founded largely for the purpose of trying an experiment in Christian living"? Professor Morison says that after the dissolution of the Virginia Company the Virginians made no effort for almost seventy years to found a college, yet the Virginia Assembly passed a resolution in 1661 for the purchase of land for a college and free school, some of the members subscribed "considerable sumes of money and quantityes of tobacco", and steps were taken to "gather the charity of well disposed people in England". That the movement failed is explained by the distress and poverty caused by the navigation acts. T. J. WERTENBAKER.

Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts. Volume XXXI, *Collections: Harvard College Records* (Part III). (Boston, the Society, 1935, pp. 534.) This volume consists of documents on Harvard history for the period 1650-1767 and supplements the records of the college to be found in Volumes XV and XVI of the publications of the Colonial Society.

Catholicism in New England to 1788. By ARTHUR J. RILEY. (Washington, Catholic University of America, 1936, pp. ix, 479, $1.25.) One closes this careful, well-documented analysis, not with a clear-cut picture of an organized church, as one might anticipate from the title, but with the conviction of the impossibility of such an organization in colonial New England. Father Riley's study is the history of the "moulding and development of a hostile viewpoint". The European genesis of that viewpoint is briefly sketched; its evolution in America is traced in various types of colonial literature, notably in sermons, catechisms, textbooks, diaries, almanacs, and legal enactments. An investigation of the broadsides, newspapers, and magazines of the period, of its official literature, of its histories, of its poetry and drama, would have furnished cumulative evidence of the pervasiveness of the Puritan outlook on Catholicism. Father Riley's discussion of New England captives in Canada and of the French neutrals in British America constitutes a valuable contribution. Attention should be called to a misstatement in regard to the Dudleian Lectures. The author states (p. 23, n.) that the "last recorded lecture on the 'Errors of Popery' was in 1922" and that "the entire series has been continued until the present". According to records in the office of the president of Harvard University, the president and fellows, on November 28, 1910, agreed that the third lecture on "the idolatry of the Romish Church" should be dropped but that the other three should be given in rotation. To this decision the trustees of the Dudleian Lectures assented on May 11, 1911, and since that date the third lecture has been omitted. The documents in the seven appendixes, the bibliography with its additions to standard check lists, and the very full index with its numerous cross references increase the usefulness of this objective yet sympathetic exposition of one aspect of Puritan mentality. The volume, it is said, is the first of a co-operative history of the Catholic Church in America. Father Riley has set for the work a high standard of scholarship. SISTER MARY AUGUSTINA.

The Old Patent of Connecticut. By R. V. COLEMAN. (Westport, privately printed, 1936, pp. 54, $1.50.) In this brief study Mr. Coleman has again demonstrated his ability to attack with discriminating scholarship the problems having to do with the beginnings of Connecticut as a colony. In spite of the fact that he has confined himself to easily accessible printed sources, his account of the history of the Old Patent of Connecticut is not only fresh but extremely provocative and can be read profitably even by those who have enjoyed the masterly analysis of Professor Andrews in the second volume of *The Colonial Period of American*

History, published subsequently to it. Indeed, these two accounts by residents of Connecticut have much in common, although Mr. Coleman's is less favorable to John Winthrop, junior. It lays bare the maze of illegality out of which finally emerged the legally established Colony of Connecticut under its patent of 1662. Mr. Coleman does not hesitate to impugn the veracity of the founders by charging distortion and simple falsification. Indeed, it is not the most pleasant reading for those Americans, such as the reviewer, whose ancestors were numbered among these sturdy founders. The text is illustrated with three useful maps, especially prepared for this purpose by the author.

LAWRENCE HENRY GIPSON.

The Town Proprietors in Vermont: The New England Town Proprietorship in Decline. By FLORENCE MAY WOODARD. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law.] (New York, Columbia University Press, 1936, pp. 163, $2.50.) This is a study of the origins of two towns in eastern Vermont, given as an example of the decadence of a form of landholding. In the seventeenth century chartered proprietors of townships had responsibilities to the future inhabitants and to the general court. Not only must settlement be made and religious and educational opportunities provided, but the proprietary were to improve and gradually alienate lands held in common. The quasi-corporation lapsed upon the establishment of individual ownership. The author thinks that this system was not of European origin but a device to satisfy the economic needs of time and place. In the eighteenth century those needs had altered. The responsibilities of the proprietary were forgotten in the eager speculation for land. Windsor, the charter of which was granted by New Hampshire, and Hyde Park, a creation of the new government in Vermont, exhibit their proprietors as interested mainly in the sale of common lands. The associations had therefore a brief existence, the second generation never entered upon vested rights, and non-proprietary settlers did not resist them. On the other hand, these towns suffered from lack of planning. One cannot help wondering if the cases discussed are typical. Vermont in the period 1761-1791 was struggling under peculiarly adverse conditions, which exaggerated speculative tendencies. It would be pertinent to have a similarly detailed study of contemporary townships in an area where jurisdiction and title were less contested.

B. REYNOLDS.

Boston under Military Rule, 1768-1769, as revealed in a Journal of the Times. Compiled by OLIVER MORTON DICKERSON. (Boston, Chapman and Grimes, 1936, pp. xiii, 137, $4.00.) This little-known journal gives a story of the daily happenings in Boston from September, 1768, to August of the following year. This account of events, which appeared anonymously under various roughly similar titles, was published contemporaneously as an instrument of propaganda against the British government. Its chief value is the indication it gives of the temper and methods of those who opposed the government. It also reminds us that journalistic partisanship of the unblushing type is no recent discovery in this country.

TROYER S. ANDERSON.

Albany: Dutch, English, and American. By CODMAN HISLOP, with a Foreword by Dixon Ryan Fox. (Albany, Argus Press, 1936, pp. xv, 413. $3.50.) To satisfy the local history needs of students in the Albany public schools is the object of this volume, though it is likely to prove popular with the general reader as well. The illustrations, many of them from the collection of Ledyard Cogswell, jr., are both quaint and informing. The driving style of the author makes full use of the dramatic and picturesque, but the growth of Albany is properly attributed

to its strategic location and to the commercial spirit of its settlers. Though the book is not intended for a full-fledged local history, it must inevitably be considered from this viewpoint. Here it suffers from all too common defects. As soon as the Revolution is passed, the synthesis of its organization weakens, and brief topical treatments become the rule. Uncritical pride in the locality shows itself when Washington and Philip Schuyler are characterized as "the two men to whom Americans owe citizenship in a free republic". The frontispiece is not Kiliaen van Rensselaer, the first patroon, though it may be his grandson, the first lord of the manor. Nor is the final page of the bibliography correct in adding a middle initial to the name of William Smith, New York's early historian. Such slips as these are frequent and betray the haste in which the book must have been written. EDWARD P. ALEXANDER.

The Country Printer: New York State, 1785-1830. By MILTON W. HAMILTON. (New York, Columbia University Press, 1936, pp. xiii, 360, $3.75.) This volume consists of two parts. In the first place it seeks to resurrect in two hundred and fifty pages the almost forgotten printers of rural newspapers in New York State for the half century following the War for Independence. Then follow three appendixes of great value to historians: a complete list of more than six hundred country printers, arranged alphabetically, making fifty-five pages of valuable biographical material; statistical tables showing the contents of the country newspapers at five different periods; and a significant list of libel suits against the early country printers. Dr. Hamilton has interpreted the rural press as an agency in politics, economics, and culture. He had pretty much an untrodden field, but his masterful treatment of it will make unnecessary a restudy of the subject. A map shows the spread of newspapers in New York down to 1810. A complete bibliography and an excellent index add the finishing touches to a work that is at the same time scholarly, well-written, and useful. The volume appears as the fourth in the historical series issued by the New York State Historical Association and is a beautiful example of the best work of the printer today. Perhaps the least satisfactory portion of the study is chapters IV and V which explain the influence of newspaper editors in party politics. A prodigious amount of research has gone into the making of this book, and the author has opened to the historical investigator a new and a rich mine of information.
A. C. FLICK.

Chasing the Bowhead. By Captain HARTSON H. BODFISH. Recorded by Joseph C. Allen. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1936, pp. ix, 281, $3.00.) On August 17, 1880, Hartson H. Bodfish, a lad of seventeen, left his home town, West Tisbury, Martha's Vineyard, on a whaling voyage around Cape Horn to the Arctic—a venture that was to last six years and to inaugurate a career of thirty-one years in the far north. The story of his early life and of his adventures until 1911 is now written for him by Joseph C. Allen in a straightforward, episodic manner that reveals Captain Bodfish as a veritable embodiment of Yankee shrewdness, ingenuity, and resourcefulness. Based upon recollection and a "sea-chestful of logs", the book is a tale of adventure as well as a description of the techniques of chasing the bowhead, or arctic whale. It is a saga of the decline of an industry, replete with anecdotes, with observations of the natives and wild life of the north, and with descriptions of the countless devices used by the whalemen to survive in a state of frigid isolation. The practical, efficient Captain Bodfish appears as a hardy leader animated by the profit-success motive and by the hunting instinct, which he regards "as a prominent part in the

make-up of all normal men". Intent upon being the first to arrive in the whaling season, he pioneered in wintering in the Arctic. His book is an indispensable source for the study of whaling. Would that all the historian's documents were so entertaining, so modestly and so attractively written, and printed in such handsome form. CURTIS NETTELS.

ARTICLES

HENRY E. SCOTT. Hon. James Parker Parmenter [1859-1937]. *New Eng. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, July.

HENRY O. SMITH. Early Church Records of Nottingham, Massachusetts, now Hudson, New Hampshire. *Ibid.*

EDWARD D. ANDREWS. The County Grammar Schools and Academies of Vermont [monograph, pp. 211]. *Proc. Vermont Hist. Soc.*, Sept., 1936.

JOHN SPARGO. Our Heritage: An Obligation and a Challenge [career of Ethan Allen]. *Ibid.*, Mar.

LEONARD F. WING. Ethan Allen, the Soldier. *Ibid.*

G. ANDREWS MORIARTY. The Governor of New Providence, West Indies, in 1702: The Administration of Governor Elias Hasket of Salem in the Massachusetts Bay [concl.]. *Essex Inst. Hist. Coll.*, July.

HOWARD SWIGGETT. A Portrait of Colonel John Butler. *New York Hist.*, July.

KARL J. R. ARNDT. John Christopher Hartwick, German Pioneer of Central New York. *Ibid.*

RALPH V. HARLOW. Gerrit Smith and the Free Church Movement. *Ibid.*

EDWARD A. FUHLBRUEGGE. New Jersey Finances during the Revolution. *Proc. New Jersey Hist. Soc.*, July.

WHEATON J. LANE. The Morris Canal. *Ibid.*

BURTON ALVA KONKLE. David Lloyd, Penn's Great Lawmaker. *Pennsylvania Hist.*, July.

PAUL A. W. WALLACE. Conrad Weiser and the Delaware. *Ibid.*

HOWARD C. DOUDS. Merchants and Merchandising in Pittsburgh, 1759-1800. *Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag.*, June.

FRANK B. SESSA. Walter Forward in the Pennsylvania Constitutional Convention of 1837-1838. *Ibid.*

MARCELLIN C. ADAMS. The Charcoal Iron Furnace at Shadyside Station in Pittsburgh. *Ibid.*

CALLISTA SCHRANN. William Findley in Pennsylvania Politics. *Ibid.*, Mar.

DOCUMENTS

Two Documents relating to Ira Allen. *Proc. Vermont Hist. Soc.*, Dec.

Memoirs: The Reverend Benjamin Wooster. *Ibid.*

JAMES W. SNYDER, JR., ed. Voyage of the *Ophelia* from Boston to Canton: Excerpts from the Journal of Captain Samuel Hill [*ca.* 1815]. *New Eng. Quar.*, June.

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

Indian Affairs in Georgia, 1732-1756. By JOHN PITTS CORRY. (Philadelphia, George S. Ferguson, 1937, pp. 197, $2.50.) This book deals with a more important subject than its title might lead the uninitiated to believe. In effect it is a continuation of Verner W. Crane's *Southern Frontier, 1670-1732*, with the newly established colony of Georgia supplanting South Carolina as England's southern outpost against Spanish Florida and French Louisiana. In this book, as in Crane's, Indian affairs form the central theme. According to Dr. Corry, the Indian problem of Georgia was threefold: to reconcile the Indians to the intrusion of the English upon their land, to gain their co-operation in trade, and to win their alliance against the neighboring French and Spaniards. He concludes that Georgia resolved all of these problems "admirably and in many ways more successfully than had the richer and more powerful Carolina", and he attributes the success of Georgia mainly to James Oglethorpe but also to the fact that the English were more liberal than their French and Spanish rivals in giving

presents and extending credit to the Indians. This success probably needs qualifications. However that may be, the reviewer believes that Dr. Corry has laid too much stress on the international aspect of Indian affairs and too little on their influence upon the development of British colonial policy and imperial organization. Even as he conceived his problem, his presentation of the results of his study is open to criticism at several points, and in general it lacks clarity and vividness. Nevertheless, he has made a useful contribution to the history of the southern frontier, for he has told a story that needed telling, has brought to light a great deal of information drawn from French and Spanish as well as English sources, and has tried with a considerable measure of success to show the larger significance of this bit of local history. ARTHUR P. WHITAKER.

The Papers of Randolph Abbott Shotwell. Volume III. Edited by J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON, with the collaboration of Rebecca Cameron. (Raleigh, North Carolina Historical Commission, 1936, pp. 466.) This is the concluding volume of the Shotwell Papers, which the North Carolina Historical Commission began publishing in 1929. In the first two volumes Shotwell recounted his experiences and emotions as a Confederate soldier and as a newspaper editor following the war. In this volume he continues with a description of Ku Klux Klan activities in western North Carolina, of his implication in this organization, of his arrest, imprisonment, trial in Raleigh, and of his conviction, with a fine of $5000 and a sentence to six years' hard labor in the Albany State Penitentiary in New York. Shotwell pours out a profound hatred and bitterness toward his persecutors and proves rather conclusively the injustice of his sentence and the venality of the judge and the jury. He writes with vividness and point. Much of the volume is made up of a diary which he kept while in the Albany prison, and the remainder was written from notes a few years later. In addition to being an important Reconstruction document, this volume gives an interesting and valuable insight into prison conditions in Albany. E. M. COULTER.

The Texas Navy in Forgotten Battles and Shirtsleeve Diplomacy. By JIM DAN HILL. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1937, pp. xv, 224, $2.50.)

Thunder on the Gulf, or the Story of the Texas Navy. By C. L. DOUGLAS. (Dallas, Turner Company, 1936, pp. 128, $1.50.) *The Texas Navy,* with the exception of some corroboratory material gleaned from the Mexican archives, adds little information to that given in the excellent series of articles by Alex. Dienst in the *Quarterly* of the Texas State Historical Association (XII, 165-203, 249-275; XIII, 1-43, 85-127), published in 1909. Had the author used R. W. Neeser's *Statistical and Chronological History of the United States Navy,* he would have gained much additional bibliographical information and would have avoided many minor errors. The nautical phraseology is at times awkward; for example, the author continually uses the word "ship" in the place of "vessel". This is confusing because in that period "ship" was used to denote a special rig of vessel. In spite of these criticisms this account will be interesting to the general reader as well as to the Texas and naval historian because it presents the naval events in their relation to the revolution as a whole. The bibliography, though far from exhaustive, is useful. The illustrations are especially valuable; they consist of two diagrams of actions, reproductions of four contemporary drawings, and a sketch map of the field of operations given on the end papers. The hitherto unpublished contemporary drawings and excerpts from diaries likewise give some historical value to *Thunder on the Gulf,* an account of the Texas navy written for the general public. GEORGE F. HAUGH.

ARTICLES

PAUL H. GIDDENS. Governor Horatio Sharpe and his Maryland Government. *Maryland Hist. Mag.*, June.

MINNIE G. COOK. The *Susan Constant* and the *Mayflower*. *William and Mary Coll. Quar. Hist. Mag.*, Apr.

G. H. S. KING *et al.* Notes about Williamsburg. *Ibid.*

W. B. MCGROARTY. Sergeant John Champe and Certain of his Contemporaries. *Ibid.*

H. L. GANTER. The Machiavellianism of George Mason. *Ibid.*

W. R. TURNER. Some Early Nottaway County History. *Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, July.

FLETCHER M. GREEN. Gold Mining in Ante-Bellum Virginia. *Ibid.*

MRS. LYON G. TYLER. Rev. Maj. Giles Buckner Cooke [1838-1937]. *Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag.*, July.

DAN LACY. Records in the Offices of Registers of Deeds in North Carolina. *North Carolina Hist. Rev.*, July.

MARK F. BOYD. Expedition of Marcos Delgado, 1686. *Florida Hist. Quar.*, July.

F. W. HOSKINS. The St. Joseph Convention: The Making of Florida's First Constitution. *Ibid.*

P. L. RAINWATER. An Analysis of the Secession Controversy in Mississippi, 1854-1861. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, June.

CHARLES S. SYDNOR. Historical Activities in Mississippi in the Nineteenth Century. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, May.

JENNIE O'KELLY MITCHELL and ROBERT DABNEY CALHOUN. The Marquis de Maison Rouge, the Baron de Bastrop, and Colonel Abraham Morhouse: Three Ouachita Valley Soldiers of Fortune. *Louisiana Hist. Quar.*, Apr.

J. FAIR HARDIN. Don Juan Filhiol and the Founding of Fort Miro, the Modern Monroe, Louisiana. *Ibid.*

A. E. PERKINS. James Henry Burch and Oscar James Dunn in Louisiana. *Jour. Negro Hist.*, July.

HAROLD SCHOEN. The Free Negro in the Republic of Texas [cont.]. *Southwestern Hist. Quar.*, July.

DOCUMENTS

GEORGE H. S. KING, ed. Abstracts from Stafford County, Virginia, Deed Book, 1722-1728. *Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag.*, July.

ALICE BARNWELL KEITH, ed. Letters from Major James Cole Mountflorence to Members of the Blount Family . . . from on Shipboard, Spain, France, Switzerland, England, and America, Jan. 22, 1792-July 21, 1796. *North Carolina Hist. Rev.*, July.

A. S. SALLEY, ed. Journal of General Peter Horry [cont.]. *South Carolina Hist. and Geneal. Mag.*, July.

MABEL L. WEBBER and ELIZABETH H. JERVEY, contr. The Thomas Elfe Account Book for 1765-1775 [cont.]. *Ibid.*

EDMUND C. BURNETT, ed. Some Confederate Letters. *Georgia Hist. Quar.*, June.

MACK SWEARINGEN, ed. Luxury at Natchez in 1801: A Ship's Manifest from the McDonough Papers. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, May.

WESTERN TERRITORIES AND STATES

Norwegian Emigrant Songs and Ballads. Edited and translated by THEODORE C. BLEGEN and MARTIN B. RUUD. (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1936, pp. 350, $3.00.) It is probably well that much of the early writing of the history of immigration into the United States was done by statisticians. A solid framework of facts was built up before an attempt was made to sift the propaganda, the conflicting reports, and the colored reminiscences that made up such a large part of the contemporary literature relating to the movement. Now, however, the time has come to utilize these sources, which reflect the personal aspects of what was a very human experience, and again historians of the

Norwegian migration show that they are a long step in advance of the investigators who are interested in other nationalities. Professors Blegen and Ruud have collected the text and translation of about sixty Norwegian emigrant songs and ballads that appeared between 1836 and 1878. Each is prefaced by a brief introductory note about the author and the circumstances attending composition. No new sentiment or unexpected emphasis is apparent, but the emotional reactions of thousands of obscure individuals are graphically revealed. The editors have not attempted a metrical translation and in an effort to preserve the informal character of many of the lines have not hesitated to use such expressions as "you bet", "by golly", and "the kids". MARCUS L. HANSEN.

Military Posts and Camps in Oklahoma. By WILLIAM BROWN MORRISON. (Oklahoma City, Harlow Publishing Corporation, 1936, pp. vii, 180, $2.50.) The concentration of Indian tribes in Oklahoma made necessary many military establishments to preserve order and protect both white and red men. In this book Mr. Morrison locates and gives in considerable detail the history of more than a score of such camps and forts. The most important post of those established since the Civil War is Fort Still, first built in 1868 and still maintained as one of the largest military establishments in the United States. Into his account of the forts the author has woven much of the frontier history of Oklahoma. There are glimpses of explorers and their operations, descriptions of soldiers' work and amusements at these old forts, and accounts of important or interesting events pertaining to the posts or their respective vicinities. Considerable space is devoted to sketches of the more important army officers who served on this frontier. The book has been written almost entirely from printed sources. Its most disappointing feature is that the author apparently did not examine the vast collection of documentary material bearing on these posts in the archives of the War Department. The bibliography (which has not been scientifically prepared) contains several newspapers and periodicals and a fairly complete list of books bearing on Oklahoma's border history. The book is interesting and should prove of some use to students of Oklahoma frontier history. A map and eight illustrations add to its attractiveness. RUPERT N. RICHARDSON.

Civilization. By THOMAS WILDCAT ALFORD, as told to Florence Drake. [Civilization of the American Indian Series.] (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1936, pp. xiii, 203, $2.50.) Born about 1860 in Oklahoma among the Absentee Shawnee, although his mother belonged to another branch of the tribe and was the grand-daughter of the great Tecumseh, Alford traces his own passage from savagery to civilization by way of McGuffey's readers, the *Youth's Companion,* Hampton Institute, and the Christian religion. His story is interesting and significant for the details of his own education and his difficulties in earning a living among his people after his return from Hampton, as well as for the glimpses here and there of "the development of a wild country by the white man". For himself he seems to have had few doubts as to the utility of the white man's pattern of life, in spite of the fact that he was somewhat troubled by the vagaries of Christian denominationalism, the politics of the white man's government, and the sharp demarcation between orthodox belief in Christian miracles and skepticism of Indian tribal tales of wonder. For the coming generation he is less sure. He points out that the younger Indians have certainly adapted themselves to high-powered cars, liquor and gambling, bobbed hair, fashionable clothes, manicured nails, and smart back-chat; but he wonders whether they will succeed in making a stable place for themselves in a world where none of

the ideals and standards of their forefathers provides a useful guide to conduct. Retold by Florence Drake in simple, readable English, the book lacks the indirect but arresting touch of the Indian weaver of words. The result may leave a reader with some doubt as to the record's authenticity, but I believe that doubt is not justified. KATHARINE ELIZABETH CRANE.

History of Hawikuh. By FREDERICK WEBB HODGE. (Los Angeles, Frederick Webb Hodge Anniversary Publication Fund, 1937, pp. xviii, 155, 26 plates, $3.00.) Some time ago friends and admirers of Hodge decided to honor this distinguished scholar on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the beginning of his interest in archaeology by collecting a publication fund. It is gratifying that the first volume issued by this fund should be from the pen of Hodge himself. The *History of Hawikuh* takes us back to the early history of New Mexico. Hawikuh was one of the elusive Seven Cities of Cibola. Its ruins, excavated by Doctor Hodge years ago, may be seen a short distance south of the present Zuñi pueblo. In tracing its history Hodge reviews and digests for us in his habitual lucid manner all the known documentary evidence. He follows the expeditions and chronicles of soldiers and friars, weaving an interesting connected story from many loose ends. The expeditions of Coronado, Chamuscaco, Espejo, Oñate, and Diego de Vargas are studied in considerable detail. Of the missionaries, Alonso de Benavides is extensively quoted in his memorial of 1634. The presentation and value of the volume are greatly enhanced by a large number of plates, many of them photographs of inscriptions found on El Morro or Inscription Rock, now a National Monument. This famous rock, located near Zuñi, marks one of the most vivid pages in American history. Many an expedition camped by this rock, and their leaders carved their names and wanderings for posterity. The volume, abounding in scholarly notes, contains an extensive bibliography and a detailed index. It is a worthy initiation of what promises to be a series of notable publications. Dr. Hodge has completed several manuscripts narrating his excavations and archaeological studies in Hawikuh and other places in the Southwest. We hope that subsequent volumes will bring out some of these unpublished materials. AGAPITO REY.

Pay Dirt: A Panorama of American Gold-Rushes. By GLENN CHESNEY QUIETT. (New York, Appleton-Century, 1936, pp. xxv, 506, $4.50.) A vivid, detailed, and well-written account of the exciting events connected with the discovery of gold in the West.

The Man Who built San Francisco: A Study of Ralston's Journey with Banners. By JULIAN DANA. (New York, Macmillan, 1936, pp. xii, 397, $3.50.)

San Francisco's Chinatown. By CHARLES CALDWELL DOBIE. (New York, D. Appleton-Century, 1936, pp. ix, 336, $5.00.) Founder of the Bank of California, active regent of the University of California, builder of the Palace Hotel, chief financial backer of the Central Pacific railroad and of many another project for California development, a dominant factor in Nevada mining, and foremost victim of the Great Diamond Hoax, William Ralston may not deserve full credit for building San Francisco, but in the sixties and seventies he was almost synonymous with it. Seeing some of the frailties of this "warm-hearted" and "warm-blooded" banker, Mr. Dana glosses over others. His volume is not so competent an analysis of Ralston the banker as is the recent life by Cecil Tilton; it is, in fact, less a biography and more a spicy collection of anecdotes about old San Francisco, generously flavored with quotations from its informal and hilarious journalists. Mr. Dobie's *Chinatown* is just as obviously designed for popular consumption,

and it likewise purports to be history. The author does not hesitate, however, to indulge in protracted special pleading or to philosophize at length upon the mutual misunderstandings that arose so frequently when Orientals and Occidentals met. His volume goes beyond a mere account of Chinese persecution, tongs, opium smoking, prostitution, gambling, religion, economy, and society in San Francisco to sketch the history of the celestials in California. It is a very pleasant book, an attractive souvenir of the West's most famous bizarre metropolitan quarter; and its writing was patently a labor of love.

JOHN WALTON CAUGHEY.

ARTICLES

WILLARD ROUSE JILLSON. Kentucky Geography: An Historical Sketch. *Reg. Kentucky State Hist. Soc.*, July.

SAMUEL L. WILSON. John Bradford, not Thomas Parvin, First Printer in Kentucky. *Filson Club Hist. Quar.*, Apr.

R. C. BALLARD THRUSTON. The Lincolns in Jefferson County. *Ibid.*, July.

THOMAS C. FISHER. The Log Run Baptist Church. *Ibid.*

HAMBLETON TAPP. Robert J. Breckinridge during the Civil War. *Ibid.*, Apr.

HELEN L. SPRINGER. James Speed, the Attorney General, 1864-1866. *Ibid.*, July.

C. H. CRAMER. Duncan McArthur: The Military Phase. *Ohio State Arch. and Hist. Quar.*, Apr.

LEE NEWCOMER. Construction of the Wabash and Erie Canal. *Ibid.*

WELLINGTON G. FORDYCE. Nationality Groups in Cleveland Politics. *Ibid.*

MARGARET HAFERD. The Shrine of Our Lady of Consolation, Carey, Ohio. *Rec. Am. Cath. Hist. Soc.*, June.

THEODORE G. GRONERT. Senator Henry S. Lane. *Reg. Kentucky State Hist. Soc.*, July.

FAYETTE B. SHAW. Transportation in the Development of Joliet and Will County. *Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc.*, Apr.

WALKER D. WYMAN. Kansas City, Missouri: A Famous Freighter Capital. *Kansas Hist. Quar.*, Feb.

W. SHERMAN SAVAGE. Legal Provisions for Negro Schools in Missouri from 1890 to 1935. *Jour. Negro Hist.*, July.

SIDNEY GLAZER. Patrons of Industry in Michigan. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, Sept.

Directory of Iowa Territorial Officials. *Iowa Jour. Hist. and Pol.*, July.

J. C. CUNNINGHAM. Sons of the Soil. *Ibid.*

RAY C. STILES. The Historical, Memorial, and Art Department of Iowa. *Annals of Iowa*, July.

T. J. FITZGERALD. The Place Names of Des Moines County, Iowa. *Ibid.*

SETH J. TEMPLE. Camp McClellan during the Civil War. *Ibid.*

MARIE HAEFNER. Rivalry among the River Towns. *Palimpsest*, May.

HUBERT H. HOELTJE. "Nincompoopiana" [Oscar Wilde in Iowa]. *Ibid.*, June.

JOSEPH SCHAFER. High Society in Pioneer Wisconsin. *Wisconsin Mag. Hist.*, June.

J. V. STEVENS. Getting down to Cases [the country doctor and popular diseases]. *Ibid.*

J. MARTIN KLOTSCHE. The "United Front" Populists. *Ibid.*

HJALMAR R. HOLLAND. The Climax Fire Steel [fire steels among the Indians]. *Minnesota Hist.*, June.

JOHN T. FLANAGAN. Captain Marryat at Old St. Peter's. *Ibid.*

AGNES M. LARSON. When Logs and Lumber ruled Stillwater. *Ibid.*

MARY PAUL FITZGERALD. Osage Mission: A Factor in the Making of Kansas. *Mid-America*, July.

SAMUEL A. JOHNSON. The Emigrant Aid Company in the Kansas Conflict. *Kansas Hist. Quar.*, Feb.

WILLIAM H. HAUPT. The Church in Kansas. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Epis. Church*, June.

A. T. HILL and PAUL COOPER. The Schrader Site: Prehistoric Village in Lancaster County, Nebraska; the Champe Site: Excavation of a Prehistoric House in Douglas County, Nebraska. *Nebraska Hist. Mag.*, Oct., 1936.

ALFRED SORENSON. Biographical Sketch of Edward Creighton. *Ibid.*, July, 1936.

RALPH G. COAD. Irish Pioneers of Nebraska. *Ibid.*

WALKER D. WYMAN. Omaha: Frontier Depot and Prodigy of Council Bluffs. *Ibid.*

HENRI FOLMER. De Bourgmont's Expedition to the Padoucas in 1724. *Colorado Mag.*, July.

M. L. CRIMMINS. Fort Massachusetts, First U. S. Military Post in Colorado. *Ibid.*

MATTHEW C. FIELD. Sketches of Big Timber, Bent's Fort, and Milk Fort in 1839. *Ibid.*, **May.**

M. LILLIANA OWENS. Denver's Pioneer Academy. *Ibid.*

LYNN I. PERRIGO. The Cornish Miners of Early Gilpin County. *Ibid.*

JOHN W. CAUGHEY. Southwest from Salt Lake in 1849. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, June.

CARL O. SAUER. The Discovery of New Mexico Reconsidered. *New Mexico Hist. Rev.*, July.

FRANK D. REEVE. Federal Indian Policy in New Mexico, 1858-1880 [cont.]. *Ibid.*

LANSING B. BLOOM. The Chihuahua Highway. *Ibid.*

ROBERT J. PARKER. Early Life of Thomas Oliver Larkin. *California Hist. Soc. Quar.*, Mar., June.

Id. Thomas Oliver Larkin in 1831. *Ibid.*, Sept.

EDNA M. PARKER. The Southern Pacific Railroad and Settlement in Southern California. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, June.

T. C. ELLIOTT. The Coming of the White Women, 1836 [cont.]. *Oregon Hist. Quar.*, June.

HARVIE E. TOBIE. From the Missouri to the Columbia, 1841 [expeditions to the Columbia about 1841]. *Ibid.*

DOCUMENTS

OTTO A. ROTHERT, ed. Browsing in Our Archives: A Glimpse of Alfred Pirtle, 1837-1926. *Filson Club Hist. Quar.*, July.

JAMES A. PADGETT, ed. Letters of Caleb Wallace to James Madison. *Reg. Kentucky State Hist. Soc.*, July.

ERNEST E. EAST, ed. The Journal of Charles Ballance of Peoria. *Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc.*, Apr.

Scattered Clippings of St. Louis and Some Early Laws. Missouri Hist. Soc., *Glimpses of the Past*, Apr.

A. R. FULTON. An Invitation to Immigrants [1870]. ***Palimpsest*, July.**

CHARLES W. ELLIOTT, ed. The University of Minnesota's First Doctor of Philosophy [diary of Charles Burke Elliott]. *Minnesota Hist.*, June.

MARTHA B. CALDWELL, ed. Exploring the Solomon River Valley in 1869: From the Journal of Robert McBratney. *Kansas Hist. Quar.*, Feb.

Letters Home [letters from travelers in Nebraska]. *Nebraska Hist. Mag.*, July, 1936.

ARTHUR S. AITON and AGAPITO REY, eds. Coronado's Testimony in the Viceroy Mendoza *Residencia*. *New Mexico Hist. Rev.*, July.

JOHN W. CAUGHEY, ed. The Jacob Y. Stover Narrative: History of the Sacramento Mining Company of 1849. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, June.

MARY AVERY, ed. Survey of Seattle Church Archives. *Pacific Northwest Quar.*, Apr.

E. RUTH ROCKWOOD, ed. Letters of Charles Stevens [cont.]. *Oregon Hist. Quar.*, June.

LATIN-AMERICAN HISTORY

W. S. Robertson

The Economic Literature of Latin America: A Tentative Bibliography. Compiled by the Staff of the Bureau for Economic Research in Latin America, Harvard University. Volume II. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1936, pp. xviii, 348, $4.00.) The first volume of this work dealt with the South American countries; this covers Mexico, Central America, Cuba, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, and the Panama Canal. The fact that Puerto Rico is basically Spanish in history and culture led to its inclusion; the Canal was given a place because many writings about it contain much information on near-by

Latin-American countries and because of its important part in the political and economic history of various Latin-American countries. This present volume, which lists 6276 titles, follows the same general plan as the first one (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLI, 200). For each geographical division considered there are critical essays or paragraphs commenting on the most important works. The following classifications are used: economic and social theory; Indian economy; colonial economy; economic conditions; travel and description; agriculture; industry; population; labor; trade; transportation and communication; public finance; capital migrations; international economic relations. Two interesting and valuable appendixes are included—"Notes on the Statistical Sources of Mexico and the Caribbean" and "Notes on the Collections of Economic Literature in Leading Libraries". This volume, like the first, is an important contribution to Latin-American economic bibliography. MARY WILHELMINE WILLIAMS.

Ibero-amerikanische Bibliographie. Volume XXVII, *Verzeichnis der deutsch-sprachigen Literatur.* By H. PRAESENT. (Berlin, Ferd. Dummler, 1937, pp. 28.) This includes a list of articles published in German from September to December, 1936, which deal with Latin America.

La doctrina americana del uti possidetis de 1810: Un estudio de derecho publico americano. By B. CHECA DROUET. (Lima, Librería é Imprenta Gil, 1936, pp. 154.) With a prologue by Antonio Sánchez de Bustamante y Sirven, this treatise gives an account of the doctrine of *uti possidetis* in Latin America.

La anexión de Centro América á México. RAFAEL HELIODORO VALLE, ed. Volume III, *Documentos y escritos de 1821-1822.* (Mexico, Archivo Histórico Diplomático, 1936, pp. ix, 493.)

Guide to the Law and Legal Literature of Central American Republics. By EDWARD SCHUSTER. (New York, International Book Company, 1937, pp. 153, $2.00.) A useful guide to the legal literature of six republics.

A los pueblos de Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, y Perú: La independencia económica de Sud América. By ARTHUR POSNASKY. (La Paz, Editorial Renacimiento, 1937, pp. 19.) A plea for common action by these South American nations to utilize the Desaguadero River for irrigation and water power.

Bolivia y Chile: Lecciones del pasado, advertencias para el porvenir. By AQUILES VERGARA VICUNA. (La Paz, Imprenta Intendancia General de Guerra, 1936, pp. 3, 317.) A study of the relations between Chile and Bolivia which has documents in the appendix.

The Beginnings of Hispano-Indian Society in Yucatan. By FRANCE V. SHOLES. (Washington, Carnegie Institution, 1937, pp. 9.) Supplementary Publication No. 30 of the Carnegie Institution.

El problema agrario y el crédito rural. By ENRIQUE APARICIO GONZÁLEZ. (Mexico, Imprenta Mundial, 1937, pp. 64.) The third volume of an encyclopedic series, this is concerned with the land problem in Mexico.

El gobierno mexicano: Su organización y funcionamiento. By JOSÉ MIJARES PALENCIA. (Mexico, Sociedad Mexicana de Publicaciones, 1936, pp. 345.) A much-needed account of the functioning of the government of Mexico.

Universidad nacional de Córdoba: Instituto de estudios americanistas, acta inaugural y antecedentes. (Córdoba, Imprenta de la Universidad, 1937, pp. 44.) Among other items, this contains an article by Ricardo Levene concerning the activity of Dean Funes of Córdoba in 1811.

Santa Ana y la guerra de Tejas. By José C. Valades. (Mexico, Imprenta Mundial, 1936, pp. 315.) A biography of this noted Mexican leader based partly on unpublished papers of the Santa Ana family.

The Mexican Revolution: A Defense. By Ramon Beteta. (Mexico City, Dapp, pp. 89.)

Historia de la Civilización Brasileña. By Pedro Calmon. (Buenos Aires, Imprenta Mercatati, 1937, pp. 422.) A translation by Julio E. Payro of a history of the civilization of Brazil by a Brazilian scholar, with a prologue by Ricardo Levene.

Aspectos agro-economicos do Rio Grande do Sol. By Fabio Luz Filho. (São Paulo, Livraria Academica, Saraiva y Cía, 1937, pp. 424.) An account of economic conditions in this agricultural province of Brazil.

Origenes de la nacionalidad ecuatoriana. By Alberto Muñoz Vernaza. (Quito, Editorial Gutenberg, 1937, pp. 112.) A sketch of the history of Ecuador to the opening of the struggle for independence.

Problemas internacionales. By Eduardo Diez de Medina. (La Paz, 1936, pp. 3,295.) Articles and lectures by the onetime Bolivian minister at Washington concerning international topics and problems of Bolivia.

Balmaceda: Su vida y su actuación como primer mandatario, hasta el 1º de enero de 1891. By Alfredo Eduardo Barros. (Santiago de Chile, Editorial Antares, 1936, pp. xii, 118.) The first installment of a two-volume biography of Balmaceda.

Iconografía de O'Higgins. By Eugenio Orrego Vicuña. (Santiago de Chile, Universidad de Chile, Dirección General de Prisones, 1937, pp. 96.) A brief biography of the Chilean hero with a collection of pictures.

Boletín de la junta de historia y numismática americana. Volume IX. (Buenos Aires, Rodríguez Giles, 1936, pp. xiv, 409.) Among other items this volume contains articles concerning Rosas, De Pradt, the Carreras, the Marquis of Sobremonte, and Vicente López y Planes.

Anuario de La Razón: Panorama de la vida argentina, 1936 (Buenos Aires, Razón, 1936, pp. 292). This number not only gives a useful review of current conditions with historical data but also contains good maps of the Argentine provinces.

Comisión de Bernardino Rivadavia ante España y otras potencias de Europa, 1814-1820. With an Introduction by Emilio Ravignani. Two volumes. [Instituto de investigaciones históricas.] (Buenos Aires, Imprenta de la Universidad, 1933-1936, pp. xlix, 498; ix, 498.) This is a commemorative collection of documents in honor of the memory of one of the founders of the Argentine nation. The editor, Emilio Ravignani, who is one of the outstanding historians of Argentina, is a master in the art of arrangement and annotation. The importance of the collection is derived from its biographical value; as a contribution to international relations it is not of major significance. Rivadavia's mission and that of two or three other agents whose correspondence is included in these volumes accomplished almost nothing. Their instructions, however, are of interest because they reveal the terms which the Buenos Aires government would have been willing to accept as a condition of peace with the mother country. Among these, at one time or another, were: local self-

government within the Spanish Empire, the purchase of recognition as an independent state, and the acceptance of an autonomous monarchy under a European prince. As for Rivadavia himself, the documents show that he was patient, frugal, astute, and patriotic. J. Fred Rippy.

El Doctor Nicolás Herrera en la independencia argentina. By Pablo Blanco Acevedo. (Buenos Aires, Casa Editora Coni, 1936.) This deals with the activity of Minister Herrera with respect to the establishment of a monarchy in the onetime viceroyalty of La Plata.

Cedulario de la real audiencia de Buenos Aires. Ricardo Levene, ed. Volume II. (La Plata, Taller de Impresiones Oficiales, 1937, pp. ix, 358.) Volume III of the Publicaciones del archivo de la provincia de Buenos Aires.

Historia de San Nicolás de los Arroyos desde sus origenes hasta 1810. By Adolfo Garreton. (La Plata, Taller de Impresiones Oficiales, 1937, pp. xii, 82.) A monograph narrating the history of a town in the province of Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Los origenes de Ranchos (General Paz), 1771-1865. By Alfredo Vidal. (La Plata, Taller de Impresiones Oficiales, 1937, pp. 59.) Another monograph in the above-mentioned series.

El origen de la ciudad de Mercedes. By Alfredo A. Yribarren. (La Plata, Taller de Impresiones Oficiales, 1937, pp. 90.) A number in the same series.

Artigas. By Telmo Manacorda. (Montevideo, Imprenta Militar, 1936.) An address containing excerpts from unpublished manuscripts of Artigas.

Articles

Gaston Nerval. Europe versus the United States in Latin America. *For. Affairs,* July.

Eloy Alfaro. American Contributions to International Law. *Bull. Pan Am. Union,* Feb.

Jesús M. Yepes. Le nouveau panaméricanism. *Rev. Droit Internat.,* Jan.

Dorothy Kress. El peso de la influencia francesa en la renovación hispano-americano. *Hispania,* May.

Some of the Folk Songs and Stories of the Americas. *Bull. Pan Am. Union,* Feb.

Alfred M. Tozzer. Prehistory in Middle America. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.,* May.

Robert Lehmann-Nitsche. Einzelheiten zur Entdeckungs- und Kulturgeschichte des östlichen Sudamerika. *Ibero-Am. Arch.,* Apr.

Percy A. Martin. Portugal in America. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.,* May.

Eduardo Schäfer. Entstehung und Aufbau des Vizekönigtums in den spanischen Kolonien unter den Hapsburgeren. *Ibero-Am. Arch.,* Apr.

The Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace. *Bull. Pan Am. Union,* Feb.

Le conférence panaméricaine de Buenos-Aires. *Rev. Droit. Internat.,* Jan.

Charles G. Fenwick. The Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace. *Am. Jour. Internat. Law,* Apr.

Ingeborg Richarz-Simons. Die Interamerikanisches Friedensconferenz von Buenos Aires. *Ibero-Am. Arch.,* Apr.

Lester H. Woolsey. The New Treaties between the United States and Panama. *Am. Jour. Internat. Law,* Apr.

A. V. Kidder. A Program for Maya Research. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.,* May.

Robert Redfield. The Second Epilogue to Maya History. *Ibid.*

Lansing B. Bloom. Oñate's Exoneration. *New Mexico Hist. Rev.,* Apr.

Paul V. Murray. The Church and the First Mexican Republic. *Rec. Am. Cath. Hist. Soc.,* Mar.

R. H. Hulse. The Beginnings of the Church in Cuba. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Epis. Church.*

Juan Antonio Susto. Un jurista panameño del siglo XVIII (1726). *Bol. Acad. Pan.,* Apr.

ERNESTO J. CASTILLERO R. Diplomacia panameña en el siglo XIX (1841). *Ibid.*

MARY WATTERS. The Colonial Missions in Venezuela. *Cath. Hist. Rev.*, July.

ALCIDES BEZERRA. Os historiadores do Brasil. *Bol. Centro Estudos Hist.*, Oct., 1936.

RENATO MENDONÇA. Historia da lexicografia brasileira. *Ibid.*, July, 1936.

HENRI HAUSER. Notes et réflexions sur le travail historique au Brésil. *Rev. Hist.*, Jan.

PETER KLASSEN. The Mennonites of Brazil. *Mennonite Quar. Rev.*, Apr.

RICHARD PATTEE. Libraries and Archives for Historical Research in Ecuador. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, May.

IRVING A. LEONARD. An Early Peruvian Adaptation of Corneille's "Rodogune". *Hispanic Rev.*, Apr.

MANUEL AGUIRRE ELORRIAGA. Bolívar y Teresa de la Parra: Cartas de la insigne escritora sobre su proyecto de escribir una biografía del Libertador. *Bol. Ac. Nac. Hist.*, Dec.

Id. Un ignorado archivo bolivariano: Cartas inéditas del Libertador en un castillo de la Auvernia. *Ibid.*

VICENTE LECUNA. La batalla de Junín. *Ibid.*

FRITZ KLIEWER. Mennonite Young People's Work in the Paraguayan Chaco. *Mennonite Quar. Rev.*, Apr.

C. FIEBRIG. Deutsche Missionsarbeit im Chaco. *Ibero-Am. Arch.*, Apr.

MAURICE LEWANDOWSKI. Argentine, 1937. *Rev. Deux Mondes*, May.

GUILLERMO C. FURLONG. Un precursor de la cultura ríoplatense, T. Field, S. J. *Estudios Acad. Lit. Plata*, Feb.

ERNESTO MORALES. Don Juan María Gutiérrez, escritor. *Nosotros*, Mar.

MANUEL CARLES. Exégesis sobre la personalidad y la política del Dr. Marcelo T. de Alvear. *Hechos y Ideas*, June.

Páginas de la historia: La contribución de Hipólito Yrigoyen á la política pacifista de América. *Ibid.*, Feb.

DOCUMENTS

ROLAND D. HUSSEY, ed. Manuscript Hispanic Americana in the Harvard College Library. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, May.

Resoluciones y sanciones de la convención nacional de la Unión Cívica Radical. *Hechos e Ideas*, June.

IRVING A. LEONARD. Algunos documentos de Peralta Barnuevo. *Bol. Bib. Univ. San Marcos*, May.

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

As announced in our last issue, the Fifty-second Annual Meeting will be held in Philadelphia on December 29, 30, and 31, with headquarters at the Hotel Bellevue-Stratford. Built around the central theme of the Constitution and the role and functions of the Supreme Court, the program includes three general sessions, in which Charles A. Beard, Charles H. McIlwain, Walton H. Hamilton, and John Dickinson will participate. Other sessions will deal with the background of the idea of representative government, of the concept of property in the Constitution, of the political thinking behind the Constitution, and of the Bill of Rights. The program also includes sessions dealing with the British Empire and nineteenth century Europe. Luncheon conferences have been arranged for Hispanic-American history, Modern European history (at which Professor Carl Becker will speak), editors of historical publications, the Agricultural History Society, and the National Council for the Social Studies. The Presidential Address will be delivered by Dean Guy Stanton Ford at the dinner session on Thursday, December 30. The Mediaeval Academy and the Mississippi Valley Historical Association will hold dinners on Wednesday, December 29. The joint session with the American Philosophical Society has been arranged for the afternoon of Wednesday, December 29.

The following should be added to the *List of Research Projects in History, exclusive of Doctoral Dissertations,* published as a supplement to Volume XXXIX, No. 3, of the *American Historical Review:*

VII. France

A biography of Denis Diderot. Prog. Arthur M. Wilson, *Dartmouth.*

XVIII. United States of America

(8) Since 1782

The Free Produce movement, a little-known phase of the abolition movement. Prog. 2 yrs. Ruth K. Nuermberger, *Duke University Library.*

Appleton Oaksmith, a biography. Prog. Gustave A. Nuermberger, *Duke University Library.*

(11) Southern Colonies and States

Clay of Alabama: A family biography, with emphasis on the political careers of Governor Clement Comer Clay

and Senator Claiborne Clay. Prog. 2 yrs. Ruth K. Nuermberger, *Duke University Library.*

A chapter in the early life of Thomas Oliver Larkin, with a Foreword by Herbert E. Bolton. Fin. Robert J. Parker, *San Francisco Junior College.*

(13) Texas and the Far West

A biography of Thomas Oliver Larkin, pioneer of the Pacific. Prog. 2 yrs. Robert J. Parker, *San Francisco Junior College.*

XX. America South of the United States

(1) General

Multilateral diplomacy among the American states: The conference and congress phase, 1826-1906. Prog. Gustave A. Nuermberger, *Duke University Library.*

OTHER HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES

Among recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following may be noted: papers of Benjamin F. Wade and of William D. Kelley, several hundreds in each case; 73 volumes of newspaper clippings relating to the Spanish-American War, international politics and diplomacy, etc., collected by John M. Hay, 1860-1905; 45 letters, etc., of William Waldorf Astor, 1904-1910; fifteen boxes of pamphlets, clippings, and manuscripts relating to the Association against the Prohibition Amendment, 1920-1933; and the usual consignments of photostats from the British Public Record Office.

Of exceptional importance among recent additions to the materials in the custody of The National Archives are the extensive records of three temporary agencies of the World War period—the Council of National Defense, the War Industries Board, and the Committee on Public Information. An acquisition that should have considerable interest for scientists as well as for students of the history of Western exploration consists of correspondence and other records of the Geological Survey and its predecessors, the Hayden, Powell, and King surveys, extending from 1867 to 1900. Many field notebooks of surveys of Western mining districts are included in this collection. A group of records received from the Department of State includes treaties with Indian tribes, 1722-1868; the acts and resolutions of Congress from 1789 to 1923; records of various expositions, 1867-1915; papers relating to electoral votes, 1888-1932; and records of the Russian American Company, 1818-67.

A definite program of investigation and publication was outlined at the first annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists, held at Wash-

ington on June 18 and 19. More than 150 persons attended, and the membership of the society at that time increased to 253, of which 18 are institutional. President A. R. Newsome, in his presidential address at the annual dinner, outlined the objectives of the society in relation to three general categories of archival problems: internal economy, external relations, and professional development. The scopes and projected activities of twelve committees were outlined. Dr. James F. Kenney, acting archivist of Canada, and Dr. Ricardo J. Alfaro, former President of Panama, also spoke at the annual dinner, at which Dr. Robert D. W. Connor, archivist of the United States, was toastmaster. Papers were read at other sessions on the control of manuscripts, business archives, the Public Archives Commission, the significance of archives to the economist, the state archives department, the Survey of Federal Archives, and the Historical Records Survey, and a round table was held on archival practices and procedures. The council of the Society determined that the proceedings of the meeting will be published in the near future, and that a quarterly journal will be inaugurated next January. All publications will be under the editorial direction of Professor Theodore C. Pease, of the University of Illinois. The election of officers for the second year resulted in the choice of A. R. Newsome, president; Luther H. Evans, vice-president; Philip C. Brooks, secretary; Julian P. Boyd, treasurer; and Ruth Blair, Solon J. Buck, Margaret C. Norton, Victor Hugo Paltsits, and Lawrence C. Wroth, council members.

A recently established Conference on Methods in Philosophy and the Sciences held its first meeting at the New School for Social Research, New York City, on May 22-23. A second meeting, to be held at the same place on November 28, promises to be of interest to students of the philosophy of history. It will be in the nature of a symposium on the concept of law in the sciences. The topic will be discussed in its relation both to the physical and the social sciences. Anyone who is interested in attending is invited to communicate with the Secretary, Gail Kennedy, at Amherst College.

The Eighth International Congress of Historical Sciences will be held in Zurich, Switzerland, from August 28 to September 4, 1938. It will be organized in fourteen sections, dealing with the various fields and periods of historical studies, including prehistory, science of antiquities, auxiliary sciences, numismatics, religious, legal, constitutional, economic, social, and military history, intellectual history and history of science, and historical methods. Two kinds of papers will be presented. Those of general interest, limited to about 50 in number, will be read at the large morning sessions, while those of more special interest, limited to about 150 in number, will be read at section sessions held in the afternoon. The organization of the congress is in the hands of a committee of which Dr. George Hoffmann, Susenbergstrasse 145, Zurich 7, Switzerland, is secretary. All correspondence respecting the congress or participation in it should be addressed to him.

A new periodical, *The Huntington Library Quarterly,* makes its appearance this month. It will be devoted mainly to the publication of articles based on the researches of scholars at the Huntington Library and will probably contain more articles of interest to students in American history than did the Huntington Library *Bulletin,* which has been discontinued. Subscriptions to the new quarterly should be addressed to the Huntington Library, San Marino, California. The price is $5.00 a year.

The first issue of a new historical quarterly, *Deutsches Archiv für Landes- und Volksforschung,* appeared in January. The editors are Professors A. Brackmann, Berlin, H. Hassinger, Vienna, and Fr. Metz, Freiburg im Breisgau. Each volume is to contain at least 832 pages with many maps and illustrations. The journal is published by S. Hirzel Verlag, Leipzig, and the price is 20 M. per year. The articles in numbers 1 and 2 (listed on pages 198 to 200) indicate the general nature of the publication.

Deutsches Archiv für Geschichte des Mittelalters, edited by Karl Brandi, Wilhelm Engel, and Walther Holtzmann (Weimar, Verlag Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger), is a new journal devoted to articles, reviews, and notes concerning the history of medieval Germany. The *Archiv* will have two issues annually. The yearly subscription will be 16 M. The *Archiv für Urkundenforschung und Quellenkunde des Mittelalters* will appear as a supplement to the *Deutsches Archiv* and will have the same board of editors. It is published, however, by Walter de Gruyter, Berlin. The first number of the new series appeared in June.

The American Military History Foundation of Washington, D. C., which was organized in June, 1933, has established a new magazine, *The Journal of the American Military History Foundation.* Its objects are described in a foreword to the first number, which appeared in the spring.

The first issue of another new periodical, *The Moorsfield Antiquarian: A Magazine of History,* appeared in May. This quarterly is the result of many years' interest in history and historical research by Hugh McLellan, who established the Moorsfield Press in 1919 for the printing of material from his collections. The magazine form of publication has been adopted, however, in order to facilitate and widen the distribution of this material, hitherto unpublished and of historical value. The *Antiquarian* will include mainly source material—from manuscripts, letters, journals, and documents—bearing not only upon important historical events but also upon the political, business, and social life of the people.

The first number, "Summer, 1937", of the *Nassau County Historical Journal,* published by the Nassau County (New York) Historical and Genealogical Society, has made its appearance. The contents include an article by Etie Hedges Pennypacker on Francisco de Miranda's visit to Long

Island in 1784, including an initial excerpt, in translation, from Miranda's diary, and one by George D. A. Combes on the first Revolutionary battle on Long Island.

Beginning with Volume XLI (July) the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* is taken in charge by an entirely new board of editors, namely, Rudolph L. Biesele, Charles W. Hackett, and Walter P. Webb. Charles W. Hackett becomes managing editor, succeeding Eugene C. Barker, who retires after twenty-six years of continuous service in that capacity. By way of rounding out the forty-year period of the *Quarterly's* existence (from July, 1897, to April, 1912, it bore the name, *The Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association*), a list of the contents of the preceding forty volumes, compiled by Mrs. Coral H. Tullis, is published in the July number.

A Union Catalogue of Floridiana is being developed at Rollins College, Winter Park, Florida, under the directorship of Dr. Alfred Hasbrouck with an advisory council consisting of Professor A. J. Hanna of Rollins College, chairman, Dr. Kathryn T. Abbey, Florida State College for Women, Mr. Julien C. Yonge, editor of the *Florida Historical Quarterly,* and Mr. Watt Marchman, librarian of the Florida Historical Society.

PERSONAL

William Niven and Frederick Jones Bliss, who died on June 2 and 3 respectively, were archaeologists of distinction. Professor Niven was born in Scotland in 1850, came to the United States in 1879, and engaged for several years in mineralogical research. In 1889 his attention was turned to the field of Mexican archaeology, in which his excavations yielded many important discoveries, revealing the existance of a series of pre-Columbian civilizations. He was an honorary life member of the American Museum of Natural History and a member of various scientific societies. Dr. Bliss, who was 78 years old at the time of his death, was born in Syria and educated at Amherst and Union Theological Seminary. From 1890 to 1900 he was associated with the Palestine Exploration Fund, and his archaeological work was carried on in Palestine and Syria. In 1892 he discovered the first cuneiform tablet found in Palestine, and later he conducted excavations of a number of Palestine sites. In 1919 General Allenby appointed him member of a commission to report on buried ancient buildings in Syria and Palestine. Dr. Bliss wrote extensively on archaeological and religious subjects.

The death of Sir Robert Laird Borden, which occurred at Ottawa on June 10, must have recalled to some of our readers the notable address on "The British Commonwealth of Nations: Features of External Relations", which he delivered at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association at New Haven in 1922. Sir Robert will be remembered, of course,

primarily as a statesman, and this is not the place for an appraisal of his achievements as prime minister of Canada. Yet among his varied interests history was not the least. After his retirement from political life, in 1920, when continuing interest in public affairs combined with aloofness from the turmoil of party strife gave him a unique position as the beloved elder statesman of Canada, he found time and energy for historical writing, some of which rises to the dignity of a primary source. This is true of the last section of his *Canadian Constitutional Studies,* wherein he discussed momentous events in which he himself had borne a great part. He was actively interested in the progress of historical study in the field of Canadian imperial relations. His continuous interest in the Public Archives of Canada, both before and after his retirement, and his kindly and helpful encouragement of Canadian historical research were appropriately recognized by his election as president of the Canadian Historical Association in 1930. As prime minister of the senior British Dominion throughout the period of the World War and the peace treaties, the period of the most rapid advance in the constitutional evolution of the British Commonwealth, Borden was the leading champion of Dominion autonomy. The story of his public career must necessarily be a part, and a great part, of that evolution. He did not live to write that story himself, but he personally put in order the basic materials for it, his own papers. He directed in his will that the Dominion archivist might select from them, for preservation in the Public Archives, those having relation to his public career.

On June 11 Carlo Rosselli, the economist and a prominent leader of the *Giustizia e Libertà* anti-fascist movement at Paris, and his brother Nello, the Italian historian, were found murdered near Paris. The tragic end of Nello Rosselli at thirty-seven years of age is a distinct loss to Italian historical studies. His most notable works were *Mazzini e Bakounine* (1927) and *Carlo Pisacane* (1932). In the past few years he had been preparing studies on Montanelli and on Anglo-Italian relations during the nineteenth century. Some of his recent articles in Italian historical journals have been listed in this Review (including the present issue, p. 202). He resided in Italy with his wife and four children. It was customary for him to visit his older brother during his frequent trips abroad. The murder is inexplicable except in the light of the struggle between fascists and anti-fascists, and it seems to have been a fortuitous circumstance that Nello met the same fate as his brother.

Abraham Valentine Williams Jackson, professor emeritus in residence of Indo-Iranian Languages at Columbia University, died suddenly on August 8. Born in New York City on February 9, 1862, he was educated at Columbia and Halle, and his entire career as a scholar was passed at his

alma mater, where he was successively assistant in English and instructor in Zend, instructor in Anglo-Saxon and Indo-Iranian, and adjunct professor of the English Language and Literature until, in 1895, he was appointed professor of Indo-Iranian languages, retiring from active teaching in 1935. An inspiring teacher and a distinguished savant, his interests centered in the Indo-Iranian East, and he gradually specialized in Iranian, especially in Zoroastrianism and, in his later years, Manichaeism. Primarily concerned with the literatures and religions of his chosen field, he was necessarily brought into contact with the history of this area. He edited for the Grolier Society a *History of India* in nine volumes (1906-07), a collection of selected passages from standard authorities so arranged as to make a complete record down to 1907. His *Zoroaster, the Prophet of Ancient Iran* (1899) is a careful digest of all sources, both Oriental and Classical, on the founder of Zoroastrianism, based almost exclusively on tradition. In two works, *Persia, Past and Present* and *From Constantinople to the Tomb of Omar Khayyam* (1906 and 1911), he not only described the lands and the cities which he had visited but also traced their history as recorded by Iranian, Arabic, and Classical authors, or as set down by earlier European travelers.

Dr. Robert Karl Reischauer, whose tragic death occurred in Shanghai on August 14 as a result of the accidental bombing of the International Settlement by Chinese planes, was one of the best equipped and most promising scholars in the field of Far Eastern studies. Born in Japan in 1907, he received his early schooling there and incidentally acquired a fluent command of spoken Japanese, to which he added in later years an exceptional facility in reading the written language. He graduated from Oberlin College in 1928 and took his doctor's degree at Harvard in 1935. In the latter year he became a lecturer in the School of Public and International Affairs and an instructor in Japanese at Princeton University. Just prior to his departure for the Far East this summer, the Princeton University Press published in two volumes his *Early Japanese History,* covering the period from about 40 B.C. to 1167 A.D. Based for the most part upon Japanese sources, this work will be of great aid to all interested in the field. These volumes were to be the first in a series covering a chronicle of events in Japanese history down to modern times. Apart from articles, Dr. Reischauer also published a study of "Alien Land Tenure in Japan" in the *Transactions* of the Asiatic Society of Japan, 1936.

On August 17 Thomas Robinson Moore died at his country home at Shekomeko, New York, a few months after his retirement from the department of history of the College of the City of New York. He was born at Felton, Delaware, on June 1, 1870, received his A.B. degree from Wesleyan in 1897, his M.A. degree from New York University in 1905, and his Ph.D.

degree from the same institution the following year with a dissertation on the history of trust companies in the state of New York. Before joining the City College faculty in 1904 he taught successively at the Conference Academy at Dover, the Ohio Military Institute, Cincinnati, the State Normal School, Jamaica, Long Island, and in the public schools of New York City. Professor Moore's field of interest was English constitutional history.

A name well known to college teachers and students of an earlier generation was that of Oliver Joseph Thatcher, who died on August 19. Born in 1857, Professor Thatcher was graduated in 1878 from Wilmington College where he received his doctorate in 1890, having studied meanwhile at Union Theological Seminary, the University of Berlin, and the American School of Classical Studies in Athens. From 1888 to 1892 he taught ecclesiastical history at the United Presbyterian Theological Seminary, and for the next sixteen years he was a member of the History Department of the University of Chicago, serving successively as instructor, assistant professor, and associate professor. He retired in 1908. His *Europe in the Middle Age* (1896) and *A General History of Europe, 350-1900* (1900), both written in collaboration with Ferdinand Schevill, were popular textbooks in their day. He collaborated with Edgar H. McNeal in *A Source Book for Medieval History* (1907) and *Europe in the Middle Age* (1920). He was the author of *A Sketch of the History of the Apostolic Church* (1894) and *Studies concerning Adrian IV* (1903).

Historical scholarship has suffered a serious loss in the death of Élie Halévy, which occurred at Sucy-en-Brie (Seine-et-Oise) on August 21. After the publication of his first book, *La théorie platonicienne des sciences* (1896), M. Halévy turned to the field of English social history, in which he made distinguished original contributions. His study of the Benthamite school, *La formation du radicalisme philosophique*, published in three volumes in 1900-03, established his reputation as a historian; the late Graham Wallas declared that Halévy was the only living man who had ever been through the vast mass of Bentham's manuscripts in the library of University College, London. Halévy's magnum opus was to have been a history of the English people since 1815, and though he did not live to complete this colossal undertaking, the volumes that he published cover the periods 1815-41 and 1895-1915. He was engaged in the history of the 1840's at the time of his death. He was perhaps the first historian to give due weight to the influence of Puritan Nonconformity on English social evolution in the nineteenth century. For forty years he spent part of every year in England, and he was a familiar figure at the British Museum. At the time of his death he was a professor at the École libre des sciences politiques and editor of the *Revue de métaphysique et de morale*.

Three colleges have recently appointed professors of history as their presidents: Williams College, James Phinney Baxter, 3d; St. John's College, Stringfellow Barr; Illinois College, Harris Gary Hudson.

The archivist of the United States announces the appointment of Frank D. McAlister, formerly a deputy examiner in the division of accessions, to the position of chief of the division of Department of Justice archives. Dr. Edmond S. Meany, of the division of classification, has resigned to accept a teaching position with the Hill School at Pottstown, Pennsylvania.

Dr. Hunter Dickinson Farish has been appointed as director of the department of research and education of Colonial Williamsburg, Incorporated, to succeed Mr. Harold R. Shurtleff. Mrs. Helen Duprey Bullock has been appointed as archivist.

Demass Barnes, head of Shady Side Academy's history department, has been appointed acting headmaster of the school to serve until the selection of a permanent successor to Dr. Harold A. Nomer, who recently resigned.

Waldemar Westergaard has been appointed as chairman of the history department in succession to Frank J. Klingberg, who resigned after serving in this position ever since the establishment of the University of California at Los Angeles eighteen years ago. At Muhlenberg College J. Edgar Swain has been made head of the history department.

Announcement is made of the following promotions: *University of California at Los Angeles,* Clinton N. Howard to be assistant professor and Roland D. Hussey to be associate professor; *University of New Mexico,* Dorothy Woodward to be assistant professor; *University of Wisconsin,* Milwaukee Center, George T. Hunt to be assistant professor and Hilmar C. Krueger to be associate professor.

The American University announces the following appointments: Louis C. Hunter, formerly of the faculty of St. Johns College, to be professor of American history; Caroline F. Ware to be associate professor of American social history in the graduate school. Courses in diplomatic history will be in charge of former Undersecretary of State William R. Castle and of Carleton Savage, assistant historical adviser of the Department of State. Solon J. Buck, now of the National Archives, will be lecturer in historiography, Ralph Turner, now with the Social Security Board, will be lecturer in English economic history, and William Chapin Huntington will be lecturer in Russian history.

The following additional appointments are noted: *Oberlin College,* Howard Robinson of Ohio State University, as professor; *State College of Washington,* John Gilbert Reid, as assistant professor; *Sweet Briar College,*

Eva M. Sanford, as assistant professor; *University of Illinois,* Raymond Phineas Stearns of Lake Forest College, as assistant professor.

Leaves of absence for the first semester of this year have been granted to Jessie Melville Fraser, of Sweet Briar College, and to Wayland F. Dunaway, of Pennsylvania State College, who is gathering material for a monograph on the Scotch-Irish of Pennsylvania.

Charles F. Mullett, University of Missouri, is a research fellow at Huntington Library this year. He will carry on research on the political and religious effects of the Toleration Act of 1689.

J. Franklin Jameson, one of the founders and the first managing editor of the *American Historical Review*, died at his home in Washington on September 28. An estimate of his work and services to historical scholarship will appear in our next issue.